THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXX JUNE, 1935 No. 180

EDITORIAL

It seems hardly possible to say anything about the King's Jubilee which has not been said already more than once. But "Church and King" is so ancient and eloquent a watchword that its meaning is not easily exhausted. There was no doubt about the religious spirit in which His Majesty himself observed his own anniversary. There have been kings of England whose piety was more spectacular, who went on crusades or became founders of monastic houses. But religion, though its expression is different from century to century, is now, as always, an affair of motive and life-purpose, and there is an old mediæval phrase, sometimes used formally, which springs to the mind—"His Most Christian Majesty." Nor was it doubtful that the British people found in Cathedral and Parish Church the natural place for the expression of their emotions. Armistice Day always reminds us that a certain minimum of religion is almost universal. This was much more than that. There was a genuine sense of thanksgiving in the national mind.

At Whitsuntide it is both natural and right to think and pray about reunion. The Pentecostal gift was and is a gift to the whole Body of Christ; in fact, it constitutes that Body. Whereas it is often supposed that a person first becomes a Christian by some process of his own origination, and then is drafted into the Church, or, as it is sometimes put, into one of the Churches, the fact is that the Church is the Mother giving birth and life to her children. The *status quo* today is in two great respects unsatisfactory. In the first place, the identity of personnel which St. Paul could assume between the baptized and the believing (see, for example, "for" in Gal. iii. 27, or the evident presuppositions of Rom. vi. 3) is no longer apparent. Baptism and faith are intended to the upper and lower sides

of the same thing, the two hands of a hand-clasp. It is expected that all the baptized will have faith, and that all who have faith will have been baptized. This has gone wrong. There are some baptized persons who appear to have little or no faith, and there are some unbaptized persons who appear to have faith. There is thus a ragged edge to our definitions.

The other grave failure is disunion. The Body of Christ, fundamentally one in its divinely created and maintained nature, and by its one baptism and its one faith, is nevertheless unhappily divided. The divisions have gone deep. They indicate different conceptions of what is meant by the Church. We of this generation have seen a marvellously quickened appreciation of the disastrous effects of these divisions and of the necessity of mending them. How is it to be done? Short-cuts are useless. Not only is it exceedingly unlikely that a breach which is several centuries old will be healed very quickly, but it is even possible that a one-sided approximation by ourselves to those who stand on our right hand or on our left may make relations more difficult with those who stand on the left or on the right. To fling open the Decani door too recklessly might make such a draught that the door on the Cantoris side would slam or even be wedged. The sort of vision to have before our eyes is that which seems to have been before the eyes of the Lambeth Bishops in 1920, the vision of a really Catholic Church. To promote that vision, to clarify our sight of it, and to encourage good desires, we are glad to be allowed by author and editor to reprint in this number an essay which appeared in the February number of *Blackfriars*. Father St. John hoped at one time that he would be able to write something expressly for our columns, but his health and his engagements have not permitted that. What he writes was addressed in the first instance to the members of an Anglican society. It is more guarded than Father Jerome's *A Catholic Plea for Reunion*. It is written with a strong sense of responsibility, and will not at all points be satisfactory to our readers, but it is written with abundance of good-will and charity.

Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and other Early Christian Papyri, edited by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat (published by the Museum Trustees, 4s.), is a volume of great interest and importance. We have become so accustomed to put the synoptists in one category and St. John in another that we exaggerate the gulf between them. Here is a fragment of

the second century, perhaps even fairly early in that century, which does something to unite the two traditions. The narrative reminds the reader of St. Mark, in that it contains: (*a*) The story of the healing of the leper, and (*b*) a question about rendering to kings "that which pertaineth unto their rule." The question is followed by (*c*) "Why call ye me with your mouth, Master, when ye hear not what I say?" and (*d*) "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you," to which there are synoptic parallels in different contexts: (*c*) Luke vi. 46 and (*d*) Mark vii. 6-7=Matt. xv. 7-9. This does not look like a narrative composed from the Synoptic Gospels, but rather one composed from the same body of tradition out of which the Synoptic Gospels were themselves composed.

Then it is to be noticed that (*a*) is preceded by: "And turning to the rulers of the people he spake this saying; . . . Search the scriptures, in which ye think that ye have life; these are they which bear witness of me. (3) Think not that I came to accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. (4) And when they said, We know well that God spake unto Moses, but as for thee, we know not whence thou art, Jesus answered and said unto them, Now is your unbelief accused. . . . (5) (?) They gave counsel to the multitude to ([?] carry the) stones together and stone him. (6) And the rulers sought to lay their hands on him that they might take him and ([?] hand him over) to the multitude; and they could not take him, because the hour of his betrayal was not yet come. (7) But he himself, even the Lord, going out through the midst of them, departed from them."

This clearly recalls John v. 39, ix. 29, and the group of passages John viii. 59, x. 31, vii. 30, 44, x. 39. It is difficult to resist the impression that our document is a second-century copy of a first-century document which drew from the mass of things remembered some of the things which are enshrined in the four Gospels and a few of the things which were rejected. Can we go so far as to say that the writer is among those who had "taken a hand to draw up a narrative concerning those things which have been fulfilled among us," of whom St. Luke speaks in his Preface?

A further point is that the leper-story contains the following: "There cometh unto him a leper and saith, Master (διδάσκαλε)

Jesus, journeying with lepers and eating with them in the inn I myself also became a leper." Dr. Lowther Clarke says: "If this (and the variant about the tribute) appeared in Codex Bezæ, should we not say that they are quite appropriate there?" Some of the "Western" readings—*e.g.*, in the last three chapters of St. Luke—are important; others—*e.g.*, "They went down the seven steps and" in Acts xii. 10—are historically unimportant, but textually very interesting. They constantly look like genuine original recollections. The fact that like variations occur in this document suggests that the Form-Critics, however dubious the actual reconstructions proposed by some of them, are pursuing a promising line of enquiry.

The death of Francis Crawford Burkitt removes one of our great English theological scholars, and the one whose name was perhaps better known among the learned world of Europe than any other. He was a man of extraordinarily versatile and original mind, a pioneer and a skilful guide in many fields. The familiar tag, *Nil tetigit quod non ornavit*, has more than its usual relevance of him. Textual Criticism in Greek and Syriac, Historical Criticism, Apocalypses Jewish and Christian, the authority and indispensability of the Markan tradition, the value of the eschatological element in Christianity, Liturgiology, Hymnology, Church Music, Gnosticism, especially that of Mani and the Mandæans — all these engaged in turn the attention of his agile intellect. With such a record, it is astonishing to remember that he took his degree at Cambridge in Mathematics, and was in fact a Wrangler in 1886. He made himself a first-rate linguist (though we once heard him utter a false quantity), and he had a wonderful power of holding in his mind masses of detailed information and at the same time of seeing and indicating a clear line of interpretation. Thus in the textual criticism of the New Testament he was one of the first to lead the way "out of captivity in Egypt," and to point to the importance of "the agreement of Carthage and Edessa," though he would often point out that it was Dr. Hort himself who first drew attention to the excellence of *k* (Bobiensis). He did more than anyone to make Schweitzer known in England. A short essay of his in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909) on the Eschatological Idea in the Gospels is worth many a long book. His *Gospel History and its Transmission* (1907) represents his first course of lectures as Norrisian Professor, and remains to this day one of the necessary books about the Gospels. It is sad to think that we shall no longer hear his

eager, high-pitched voice, discussing with abundant knowledge, abundant enthusiasm, and occasional eccentricity the details of Syriac palæography, the inferiority of Gnosticism to the teaching of the Catholic Church, or the future of the Church of England. He was a sincere and devout Christian man, and for all his exposure of the bankruptcy of Liberal Theology a thorough Liberal. He was the best of friends, prodigal of time and strength, especially if he could help a young student or a good cause.

Nos. 2 and 3 of our new series of Theology "Occasional Papers" are now ready, *The Sub-Diaconate: a Historical Note* by E. Hermitage Day, and *Clerical Celibacy* by F. M. Downton, with a preface by Bishop Chandler, 1s. each. They are just what Occasional Papers ought to be, learned but readable, too long to be printed as articles in a monthly periodical, and deserving of more permanence than the columns of a periodical can ordinarily hope to secure. We have another in waiting, and we could do with more, if they are as good as these.

THE APPROACH TO REUNION*

I

THE new regroupings of the future are forming themselves round two clearly defined rallying points. One of these is materialism, which attracts those who have ceased to fix their eyes on a life beyond this life. The other is Christianity, towards which are gravitating those who cannot be satisfied with a materialistic explanation of the world, and who believe that in, and around, and beyond its life lies another and more perfect life, in which we are in some way sharers. The materialist grouping is as yet only a nucleus, but it has a coherent creed, a crusading spirit and definite unity of aim. In strong contrast with this small, active, homogeneous nucleus, steadily extending its circle of influence, is the huge army of Christendom, full of supernatural vitality and heroic effort, but handicapped by internal dissension, reduced sometimes almost to impotence, and unable to move forward in strength and unity on its mission to convert the world to Christ.

Is it any wonder that there is an increasing number of men and women in every one of the many sections into which Christendom is divided who are turning their thoughts more and more to the problem of reunion? They see that to remain as we are, divided and crippled in our efforts, is not merely to court the disaster of being overwhelmed by the forces of pagan materialism, but is a betrayal of our blessed Lord's commission, who has bidden us go and teach all nations, not go bewilder them with the multiplicity of our doctrines and the conflict of our many opinions.

Many of us regard reunion as the most primary and vital of all the problems that Christianity must attempt to solve in the near future. And yet we are well aware of the complications of the problem and its many difficulties. Each of us regards as fundamental to Christianity some part of the special contribution which his own section of Christendom makes to the whole, because he believes that that part was designed by our Lord to be an essential element in the religion which He founded. If we are sincere Christians, we know that we cannot give way by a fraction of an inch upon those things which we believe to have been sanctioned as necessary in Christ's intention. Any disunion among Christians will result, in some sense, in a corporate betrayal of our Lord's commission to teach the truth

* The substance of a paper read to the Reunion Society, Oxford, November 26, 1934.

to all nations, but it would be a far worse betrayal of Him to sacrifice, in the interests of an artificial unity, any truth which we believe Him to have committed to the care of His Church.

The path of those, then, who would pursue the cause of the reunion of Christendom is beset by difficulties. These can only be overcome by our blessed Lord Himself in the measure in which we allow Him by the power of His Spirit to enlighten our minds and fire our wills, till our minds begin to see the situation as He sees it and our wills begin to burn with the love that fires His Will.

The chief obstacles, apart from our individual sinfulness, which prevent Him from bringing our minds and wills into conformity with His own are the prejudices, the misunderstandings, the inherited traditions, which are integral to our surroundings and the atmosphere in which we pass our lives. These things often generate a corporate pride and even arrogance which hinder the work of God's grace, and are very hard for us to break through. We shall only do so by a firm determination to get outside our normal surroundings and make contacts of sympathy and understanding with those whose environment is very different from our own. Then we shall begin to understand what they hold so dear and prize so highly, and why they hold it with such firm conviction; what they view with fear and suspicion, and why they shrink from it instinctively; and the knowledge so gained will generate in us sympathy, understanding, and generally respect. On this groundwork in the hearts of men the power of the Holy Ghost can work, and where such material is found He will cause the truth to emerge from the chaos of conflicting opinion, so that all may see and accept it. It is in this spirit and with these presuppositions that I should like to envisage the subject.*

For Roman Catholics there can be no ultimate disagreement as to what is of faith, and no hesitation in holding with our whole heart and mind what has been defined as of faith by the Church. But defined dogmas come naturally to be applied by fallible minds to the infinitely varying circumstances of human life, and in that application there may arise deep and far-reaching differences of outlook, method, and approach. It is both natural and inevitable that this should be. The apprehension of truth by single human minds, or groups of minds, is

* In order to avoid all misunderstandings, may I say here that to a meeting such as that of the Reunion Society, where not all are of the same religious allegiance, I used for convenience the terminology which is ordinarily adopted amongst Englishmen. I speak of bishops and priests, Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics, the Church of England and the Church of Rome, without inverted commas, and entirely without prejudice to the various convictions in the many controversies which centre round the realities that these words represent.

often likely to be partial, and its application to particular problems one-sided and unbalanced in emphasis. It will be obvious, then, that among Roman Catholics, though there is necessarily unanimity in regard to the truths of faith, there are deeply rooted differences of idea as to how the problems which arise from the application of dogma to life should be approached. In treating, therefore, of the subject of reunion my fundamental principle will be the defined doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, but my approach to the problem, which is my application of this doctrine to present-day circumstances in England, is my own.

The problem is far less one of sheer dogma than we are sometimes inclined to think. True, the dogmas about which we differ are there, clear cut and uncompromising, though for many Anglicans the Oxford Movement has reduced them in number, in some cases almost to vanishing point. But the controversy about them has divided us for nearly four centuries into two opposing camps, and for nearly four centuries we have been steadily growing apart, each developing our own distinctive ethos and atmosphere, our own peculiar misconceptions and misjudgments of the other's ideas and motives, and now as corporate societies we face each other, hostile and suspicious, while the forces of materialism gather strength.

The first thing that must be done in our work for reunion is to break down and clear away the barriers of mutual suspicion and prejudice which divide us, and those barriers can only be broken down by the more complete understanding of each other which comes from personal contacts. When these contacts have been established we shall still be divided on fundamental questions of dogma, but we shall have created between ourselves a disposition of heart, a true friendship, and an understanding of each other's point of view—a congenial groundwork upon which the Holy Spirit can work. This is the essential preliminary to any talk of reunion, and without it we cannot even approach the problem.

II

I believe that the greatest obstacle to such an approach is the widespread feeling that Roman Catholics tend to minimize or deny the workings of divine grace in Anglicans. This feeling may be summarized in the words of a responsible writer,* who describes as the way of absorption what he calls the ordinary Roman attitude to reunion. "The way of absorption is a

* *Intercommunion*, by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., chap. ix., p. 121.

false way," he says, "because it implies that the truth of Christianity lies entirely on one side, and involves a denial that the Holy Spirit has taught the other side anything worth having."

Now it is Catholic dogma that grace and truth come to us through Jesus Christ by the working of the Holy Spirit, and it is also Catholic dogma that those who are baptized (whether in fact or by desire) are incorporated into the mystical Body of Christ and made His members by sanctifying grace. The only thing that can cut off a baptized person from the sanctifying grace which unites him to our blessed Lord is mortal sin. Unless, then, a Roman Catholic has the right, and he can have no such right, to say of an Anglican, "He is in mortal sin," he has no sort of business to minimize the extent or deny the existence in him of sanctifying grace. And since the possession of sanctifying grace implies the presence of the virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, it follows that whatever truth an Anglican holds by divine faith has been taught him by the Holy Ghost, and if he has learned that truth through the Church of England, then the Holy Ghost has made the Church of England His instrument for teaching it.

We believe that in the confusion and upheaval of doctrine which accompanied the Reformation the apostolic succession in the Church of England was broken, and that in consequence (apart from Baptism and Marriage) the sacraments of the Church of England are not vehicles of sacramental grace. But though *we* are bound to the sacraments, God Himself is not, and we have no warrant for saying that Almighty God does not reward the faith and devotion of those who use these ordinances by granting the graces for which they ask Him, and which they believe to be conveyed by them. Such graces would not, of course, be sacramental—in the sense that they would not be conveyed through the sacraments. So far, then, from denying or minimizing the spiritual life of Anglicans, a Roman Catholic must acknowledge that both it and the objective grace which causes it may be as deep and full as his own. The difference between us lies chiefly in this: that many Anglicans tend to regard experience as the guarantee of the validity of sacraments and of grace received; it has become for them an ultimate criterion, while for us, though it is recognized as evidence in its own limited sphere, it is not wholly reliable evidence, unless supported and authenticated by the external authority of the Church.

It is an essential part of our faith that our Lord founded a visible Church—a society, kingdom or body, which should remain through the ages organically one, in this sense; that as a society, or kingdom, or living organism cannot be divided and yet retain its identity, so the Church must always remain

indivisible; portions may be rent away by schism, but its unity remains unimpaired, though its life may be terribly weakened. This visible organic unity, so we believe, was our Lord's plan for His Church, because He knew it to be the only way by which His truth and grace could be preserved and the means of their propagation guaranteed.

Those who enjoy full external fellowship in the visible Church, Christ's Mystical Body, form a part only of its total membership, which includes also those whose fellowship, on account of their separation from visible unity, is incomplete. We believe that those who are externally separated from the unity and communion of the visible Church for any reason short of mortal sin remain nevertheless united to it internally by grace, and are our brethren because, like us, they are members of Christ, and have been made sons of God through Him.

A second and equally formidable obstacle stands in the way of an understanding friendship between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in this country. It lies in our past history. No candid student of the Reformation can view the evolution of events during that period of chaos without a feeling of profound sorrow for the sins and lost opportunities of the past. Europe was surging with new ideas and new life, the waves of which swept to meet the solid land of traditional Christendom—a land once fertile, but now so hard and dry as to resist, until too late, the forming on its surface of inlets and channels to carry off the flood and irrigate its parched and withered vegetation.

The new ideas came when the Church was ill prepared to receive and assimilate them. The Papacy, weakened in men's eyes by the long scandal of the Babylonish captivity and the great schism, was so occupied with diplomacy and intrigue that it was in danger of being regarded more as one of the rival powers of Europe than as the spiritual centre of Christendom. The Popes themselves, sometimes chosen with an eye to their capacity for political rather than for spiritual rule, were not the leaders who could or would initiate a drastic reform in head and members. There was widespread scandal and corruption in the highest ecclesiastical places, and men began to ask themselves whether an authority which tolerated and sometimes actively exploited perversions of truth and justice so gross could indeed be of God. Meanwhile, the intellectual life of the Church was at a low ebb, and, what was worse, true spirituality had declined, giving place to a formalism which emphasized external works at the expense of interior sanctification and was content to allow men's souls to starve through being unfed by the Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion.

Was it much wonder that the wave of new ideas, finding its

progress blocked and no sufficient channels in which to flow, swelled to a great flood, tearing up and destroying as it went? At the back of the reforming movement lay much that was sound and good. Apart from the desire for the abolition of the more obvious abuses connected with simony and other forms of spiritual traffic, and certain undoubted superstitions, anxiety was shewn for a more real sharing by the laity in the life of grace. This expressed itself in the wish for the restoration of frequent Communion, for liturgical reform, and for re-emphasis on congregational worship; but a sense of impotence in the face of entrenched abuses drove people into the position of rebels against authority, and, the momentum of their minds gathering speed, they ended by becoming destroyers rather than renovators of the riches of Catholic truth.

Out of the chaos of conflicting movements emerged the Church of England, strongly national in sentiment, closely bound up with the State, altered almost beyond recognition, though preserving some elements of its pre-Reformation past; but now no longer a component part of a united Christendom, but a new and independent entity. It was a dominant and persecuting body, or at least a body so closely identified with the persecuting State that the functions of the two were scarcely distinguishable (I am stating facts, not discussing values); and the fullest force of its repressive zeal fell upon the little group who still remained actively faithful in their allegiance to the Holy See. For two hundred and fifty years this little group was a harried, repressed, and dwindling minority which kept the Faith with heroic fortitude, cut off from any part in the education and the rich cultural life that was flourishing around them. From that group the Roman Catholic Church in England today is descended, and we are only now beginning to recover from the famine of the lean years of persecution; but as a body we are saturated with the glorious traditions of our Catholic forefathers and of our martyrs who suffered death for the Faith.

But these traditions of the past, glorious in themselves, undoubtedly do blind us to the fact that the disasters of the Reformation were due largely, at any rate, to worldliness and neglect of duty in high quarters, to supine toleration of abuse and corruption, and to acquiescence on the part of authority in a very low standard of spirituality; to the sins, in short, of Catholics themselves. We sometimes adopt an attitude of arrogance as if the fault were all on the other side, whereas we should be the first to confess our share of the blame for the divisions and woes of Christendom. At the same time, Anglicans must exercise a wide charity, remembering that the memory of

centuries of persecution is not easily blotted out. We stand on the threshold of a new and changing world, and we must look steadily forward to the unity of the future, not backward to the divisions and bitterness of the past; if we do this the obstacles from our past history which stand in the way of mutual understanding will gradually melt away.

A third obstacle to understanding friendship is what is generally called Rome's exclusiveness. Let me quote once again the words of Fr. Hebert:* "The Roman Church is catholic in the richness of her spiritual treasures in a liturgical, devotional, and theological tradition which sums up the life of the Christian centuries; the note of universality is writ large over her thought and her life. Yet in her exclusive claim to be Catholic she is not Catholic, but the most denominational of all denominations in so far as the claim of the infallible authority of the Pope is used as an instrument of exclusiveness in order to prove all other Christians to be in the wrong." And again: "Catholicity in the true sense belongs to the Holy Spirit; and it is impossible to accept the Roman claim in the form in which it is commonly presented by its apologists in England without denying the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom."

The Roman claim must necessarily be fundamentally the same in whatever country it is put forward; if its method of presentation differs in England from its method of presentation elsewhere, the difference is not one of principle, but of the application of a principle. I have tried to shew earlier in this paper that no Roman Catholic can safely deny the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom except by asserting that all Christians outside the obedience of Rome are in a state of mortal sin.

Let me, however, set in contrast to this charge against the Church of Rome of a special exclusiveness some words of another Anglican, Dr. Parsons, the Bishop of Southwark. I quote from the *Church Times*.† The Bishop was speaking to a group of Baptists on the subject of reunion between Anglicans and Nonconformists.

> "What their forefathers believed to be really important principles," he said, "led them to break away from the communion and fellowship of the Church of England; our forefathers could not accept those principles, neither can we, and so we remain divided. There is a state of schism between us."

Dr. Parsons then went on to explain what Anglicans have in mind when they talk of reunion.

* *Op. cit.*, chap. vii., pp. 96-97.

† October 5, 1934.

"By reunion we Anglicans mean something very much more difficult to attain than a mutual recognition and acceptance by various denominations of each other's varying beliefs, ordinances, ministries and ways of worship, as sufficient. We believe in one Body as well as one Spirit; our consciences can be satisfied with nothing less than the bringing together into one communion and fellowship, constituted by common standards of faith, common sacraments, and a common ministry, as a unity, corporate, organic, and visible, in which each part depends on the whole, all those denominations now organized independently of each other. But independency is one of the basic principles which distinguish the group of denominations to which you Baptists belong, and so long as it remains so your ideal of Christian unity must remain fundamentally different from ours."

It would, I think, be hard to say better what the Bishop has said here. Substitute the words *Church of Rome* for *Church of England*, and *Church of England* for *Baptist denomination*, and the words *independence of Rome* for *independency*, and the principles of unity he lays down as between the Church of England and the Baptists exactly fit the situation as between the Church of Rome and the Church of England. Dr. Parsons goes on to say:

"The Church of England believes that the authority of its ministry to teach and guide and rule is derived from that which our Saviour committed to His apostles. This derivation depends partly on the inward conviction of all who are admitted to a share in that ministry that they are truly called to it by the Holy Ghost; partly on a commission given by those who have received authority to ordain. As a matter of historical fact, I believe that the institution through which that authority has been maintained from the first days until now is the episcopate. You Baptists have deliberately and conscientiously rejected episcopacy. The historic episcopate has often been grievously misused and misrepresented by unworthy Bishops, but that does not alter the fact that it has always safeguarded the principle of the corporate solidity of the Church as a whole."

Again substitute *Roman Catholic Church* for *Church of England* and *Anglican* for *Baptist* and the phrase *episcopate in communion with the See of Rome* for *episcopate* and the words of Dr. Parsons exactly describe the Roman Catholic attitude towards reunion, save that we should not make the authority of the episcopate immediately dependent on the inward conviction of a call by the Holy Ghost. The truth is that Rome is no more exclusive than Canterbury. Any Christian body which holds firmly that certain dogmas and institutions are fundamental to Christianity as being part of our Lord's will must necessarily be exclusive with regard to other Christian bodies which have lost those dogmas and institutions or treat them as unessential. Exclusiveness in this sense—and it is the only sense in which a spirit of exclusiveness is legitimate—is not

centuries of persecution is not easily blotted out. We stand on the threshold of a new and changing world, and we must look steadily forward to the unity of the future, not backward to the divisions and bitterness of the past; if we do this the obstacles from our past history which stand in the way of mutual understanding will gradually melt away.

A third obstacle to understanding friendship is what is generally called Rome's exclusiveness. Let me quote once again the words of Fr. Hebert:* "The Roman Church is catholic in the richness of her spiritual treasures in a liturgical, devotional, and theological tradition which sums up the life of the Christian centuries; the note of universality is writ large over her thought and her life. Yet in her exclusive claim to be Catholic she is not Catholic, but the most denominational of all denominations in so far as the claim of the infallible authority of the Pope is used as an instrument of exclusiveness in order to prove all other Christians to be in the wrong." And again: "Catholicity in the true sense belongs to the Holy Spirit; and it is impossible to accept the Roman claim in the form in which it is commonly presented by its apologists in England without denying the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom."

The Roman claim must necessarily be fundamentally the same in whatever country it is put forward; if its method of presentation differs in England from its method of presentation elsewhere, the difference is not one of principle, but of the application of a principle. I have tried to shew earlier in this paper that no Roman Catholic can safely deny the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom except by asserting that all Christians outside the obedience of Rome are in a state of mortal sin.

Let me, however, set in contrast to this charge against the Church of Rome of a special exclusiveness some words of another Anglican, Dr. Parsons, the Bishop of Southwark. I quote from the *Church Times*.† The Bishop was speaking to a group of Baptists on the subject of reunion between Anglicans and Nonconformists.

> "What their forefathers believed to be really important principles," he said, "led them to break away from the communion and fellowship of the Church of England; our forefathers could not accept those principles, neither can we, and so we remain divided. There is a state of schism between us."

Dr. Parsons then went on to explain what Anglicans have in mind when they talk of reunion.

* *Op. cit.*, chap. vii., pp. 96-97.

† October 5, 1934.

"By reunion we Anglicans mean something very much more difficult to attain than a mutual recognition and acceptance by various denominations of each other's varying beliefs, ordinances, ministries and ways of worship, as sufficient. We believe in one Body as well as one Spirit; our consciences can be satisfied with nothing less than the bringing together into one communion and fellowship, constituted by common standards of faith, common sacraments, and a common ministry, as a unity, corporate, organic, and visible, in which each part depends on the whole, all those denominations now organized independently of each other. But independency is one of the basic principles which distinguish the group of denominations to which you Baptists belong, and so long as it remains so your ideal of Christian unity must remain fundamentally different from ours."

It would, I think, be hard to say better what the Bishop has said here. Substitute the words *Church of Rome* for *Church of England*, and *Church of England* for *Baptist denomination*, and the words *independence of Rome* for *independency*, and the principles of unity he lays down as between the Church of England and the Baptists exactly fit the situation as between the Church of Rome and the Church of England. Dr. Parsons goes on to say:

"The Church of England believes that the authority of its ministry to teach and guide and rule is derived from that which our Saviour committed to His apostles. This derivation depends partly on the inward conviction of all who are admitted to a share in that ministry that they are truly called to it by the Holy Ghost; partly on a commission given by those who have received authority to ordain. As a matter of historical fact, I believe that the institution through which that authority has been maintained from the first days until now is the episcopate. You Baptists have deliberately and conscientiously rejected episcopacy. The historic episcopate has often been grievously misused and misrepresented by unworthy Bishops, but that does not alter the fact that it has always safeguarded the principle of the corporate solidity of the Church as a whole."

Again substitute *Roman Catholic Church* for *Church of England* and *Anglican* for *Baptist* and the phrase *episcopate in communion with the See of Rome* for *episcopate* and the words of Dr. Parsons exactly describe the Roman Catholic attitude towards reunion, save that we should not make the authority of the episcopate immediately dependent on the inward conviction of a call by the Holy Ghost. The truth is that Rome is no more exclusive than Canterbury. Any Christian body which holds firmly that certain dogmas and institutions are fundamental to Christianity as being part of our Lord's will must necessarily be exclusive with regard to other Christian bodies which have lost those dogmas and institutions or treat them as unessential. Exclusiveness in this sense—and it is the only sense in which a spirit of exclusiveness is legitimate—is not

incompatible with charity, but is an expression of it; for the highest expression of charity is to do the Will of God. The fact that a doctrine of the unity and authority of the Church excludes greater *numbers* from the unity of the visible Church does not really make a Church which holds that doctrine more essentially exclusive. When this truth is fully and frankly recognized by both sides the obstacle to an understanding friendship which comes from the accusation of exclusiveness will disappear.

May I end with a suggestion? I should like to see growing up at a number of centres all over England small informal groups of Anglicans and Roman Catholics meeting together to discuss the problem of reunion, not in a spirit of controversy, but in a spirit of frank and free statement of conviction such as characterized the Malines conversations. Roman Catholics and Anglicans would then begin to be drawn together, not simply as people who get on well in social intercourse, but as friends who understand and can realize with sympathy each other's deepest convictions. Such friendship would generate an intense desire for reunion, and when this desire germinates and grows, surely the powerful working of the Holy Ghost will find in it material upon which He can operate, and reunion will become an accomplished fact. To me the deep and loving friendship between two saintly men—Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax—is the type of a friendship which ought to exist between Roman Catholics in this country and members of the Church of England. When that friendship does become actual the day will not be far off when the Church of England will be not absorbed by, but gathered into (you must allow me to end on a controversial note), the unity of the visible Church.

HENRY ST. JOHN, O.P.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF FREEDOM IN RELATION TO SECULAR TOTALITARIANISM

EVERY heresy has its twin. Any break-away from the living, balanced, fecund unity of Catholic life and thought results in the splitting asunder of two opposite positions, each of which is true as a moment of the original unity, but is false as a position and unity in itself. The oppositions struggle for supremacy on the ground that each supplies what the other lacks.

One result is that orthodoxy always appears to the devotee of one heresy to be identified with the other.

There are today sporadic and gentle voices claiming in the name of the Christian Church responsibility for the liberty of the person and associations as against totalitarian and unitarian doctrines of politics and culture. This claim is seriously weakened when it takes the form of a church's plea for its own ecclesiastical liberty, and still more when it is merely an echo of political liberalism with its plaintive cry that we shall retain "our precious heritage of liberty." The Christian Church can only confront secular totalitarianism with a doctrine that sees into and through that turn of the human spirit which is provoked by the disintegrating effects of one heresy into embracing its secular opposite. Such an insight implies a discernment and a message of power precisely because it shares with the new heresy a consciousness of the defects of the old, and at the same time meets the need of the contemporary soul in a more complete way.

Secular totalitarianism is a heresy into which the spirit of man is being driven in reaction to the disasters and spiritual void which spring from the opposite heresy of secular liberalism. The conflict between these two is the result of certain post-Renaissance and post-Reformation tendencies which have broken apart into two conceptions of man and his freedom. These two conceptions are kept in dialectic tension in traditional Christian theology. Secular totalitarianism cannot be effectively opposed by its secular opposite—namely, liberalism; but only by a re-affirmation of that synthesis which it is the ever-present task of Catholic theology to maintain in the presence of forces in the human spirit which seek to break it up.

I

St. Augustine speaks of two freedoms: *libertas minor* and *libertas major*. By the first man is free in relation to God, by the second he is free in God. The first is the ground of free will or liberty of choice: the second is the liberty of fulfilment. Man is by his nature constituted in the imperfect liberty of choice, but the same man is called by grace to the love of, and approximation to, the perfect liberty of his end in God.

Liberty of choice, though imperfect liberty, implies the possibility of achieving the second kind of liberty. It is not unrelated to man's being, but is metaphysically given with his nature. By it he shares something of the creatorhood of the creator. This *libertas minor* is the ground of man's dignity,

in that it is the power of his self-determination. In relation to creatures, man has by this minor imperfect liberty something of dominion. St. Bernard writes: "By dignity in man I mean free will, in which it is surely given him not only to excel, but to rule over all other living creatures; by knowledge, that by which he knows this dignity to be in himself, though not from himself; by virtue, that by which he then diligently seeks Him from whom he has his being, and cleaves firmly to Him when found."* Richard St. Victor writes: "Among all the goods of creation, nothing in man is more sublime, nothing more worthy, than free will. What, I ask, can be found in man more sublime, what more worthy, than that in which he was created in the image of God? Verily, liberty of the will hath the image not only of Eternity, but also of the Divine Majesty. How much nearer, beyond all else, think we that free will approaches changeless Eternity, and bears more expressly its image in itself, in this, that by no sin, by no misery, can it ever be destroyed or even diminished? Wouldest thou behold the likeness of the Majesty in it, and perceive clearly how it is stamped with the image thereof? God neither has, nor can have, any superior, and free will neither endures, nor can endure, any dominion over it; for to inflict violence upon it neither befits the Creator nor is in the power of the creature. Let all Hell, all the world, even all the hosts of Heaven, come together and combine in this one thing, they will not avail to extort a single consent from free will in anything not willed."† For St. Thomas this liberty is an essential quality of spiritual creatures and rests upon their nature, in metaphysical relation to reason and love.‡ This initial freedom or free will in spiritual creatures is a datum of existence, a metaphysical, not a moral fact. It does not guarantee that man will achieve his end. It by no means secures the good and the true. It may choose to oppose the law of man's being which tugs him to realize the second kind of freedom in which there is no choice. Infinite forces of good and evil lie within the powers of this *libertas minor*, and when it is exercised in opposition to the grace which would draw it to become transformed into the *libertas major*, it actually becomes enslaved to sub-spiritual creatures.§ Man has, therefore, to find a way from this *libertas minor* to *libertas major*, or the freedom which consists in fulfilling his essential nature, and being limited by that and nothing else. What is given

* *Liber de Diligendo Deo*, caput ii.

† De dignitate liberi arbitrii (*De statu interioris hominis*, i. 3).

‡ *De Veritate*, q. 24, a. 2; q. 14, a. 1c; *Contra Gent.*, ii. 48; *Summa Theol.*, 1a-11æ, q. 23, a. 4c; *ibid.*, q. 3; a. 4c. For the priority of nature over freedom in St. Thomas, *vide* J. Maritain, *Le Régime Temporel et la Liberté* (Paris), chap. i.

§ *Cf.* N. Berdyaev: *Esprit et Liberté* (Paris), chap. iv., 4.

to man metaphysically he has to realize morally. That is the process of redemption.

This second freedom, freedom of being, of truth, is the freedom to which man has to attain. It is the freedom which is potential in man and actual only in God. "God," says Eusebius, "doth order, augment, generate, and move all things in every place; yet is His nature not thereby polluted." God's freedom is that of being limited by His own nature and nothing else. It therefore excludes freedom of choice. It is the Divine Necessity. This perfect liberty consists in willing fully and spontaneously the behests of a perfect nature, and incapacity to will otherwise. This is the insight of Augustine,* Aquinas,† Dante,‡ St. Francis. "It is a great liberty to be able not to sin; it is the greatest liberty to be unable to sin" (Augustine). The significance of this element in the Catholic doctrine of freedom was reiterated characteristically by Von Hügel in his *Essays*.§ It is the freedom which is promised in the New Testament as the fruit of redemption in Christ: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"; "Where the spirit of the Lord is: there is liberty." This freedom of autonomy (*αὐτάρκεια*) is the freedom of God, and in it goodness and wisdom have logical priority over will, and it is the freedom of the blessed. *Unde major libertas arbitrii est in Angelis qui peccare non possunt, quam in nobis qui peccare possumus* (*Summ. Theol.*). Man as creature is not his own law. His authentic freedom, his *libertas major*, consists in his realizing the perfection of his nature in God. *Voluntas* is swallowed up in the *verum* and the *bonum*.

This dual conception of freedom, held in somewhat unstable equilibrium, with many philosophical dilemmas, in the Catholic tradition, has been opposed by two tendencies which, in differing ways, attempted to cut the knot by explaining away one or other of the positions it held. One of these, running through Dun Scotus, William of Occham, Luther, Calvin, Descartes, and Pascal, fastens almost exclusively upon the element of will in the Godhead, to the virtual exclusion of any necessity of God's nature. This tradition has practically denied the *libertas minor* to man and transferred it to the Godhead, where it replaces the *libertas major*, that in which God is and man may become bound by the perfection of their essential nature.

On the other hand, the Pelagians, who are the spiritual ancestors of modern liberalism, and the pantheists, like Spinoza and Hegel, confused the two freedoms. For the Pelagians and

* *De Civitate Dei*, xxii. 30; *Enchiridion* 30.
† *Contra Gent.*, i. 80, 93, iv. 22; *Summa Theol.*, i., q. 3, a. 6; q. 13, a. 5, etc.
‡ *Paradiso*, xxix. *ff.*
§ *Essays*, ii. 4, 7 and 8.

liberals, freedom to fulfil one's own nature was not, as in the Catholic tradition, something to be won, but was, along with the *libertas minor*, freedom of the will, something metaphysically given. For liberalism the two freedoms are the same. The pantheists were interested more in the fact that man finds himself in that loyalty to and participation in the whole which is his nature, and they confused the two freedoms by merging the minor in the major.

Both kinds of freedom and their distinction are necessary for the full balance and energy of the Christian life. Human life and its tragedy is penetrated through and through by the liberty of choice: the liberty to do wrong, the liberty to say no to God. But logical and ethical priority belongs to the other: the perfect freedom of autonomy, the freedom of a nature which has no law but its own. This freedom exists only in God, and God earns it for man through the Redemption in Christ. This *libertas major* is based upon nature, upon being, upon the good, and the *libertas minor* is given that man may attain to it. The varying emphasis laid upon these two kinds of freedom gives rise to different modes of social behaviour and theory both within and without the Church.

II

In the Middle Ages, when the idea of freedom for perfection was dominant, liberty was sought and fought for, not in its own name, but in the name of justice.* Men wanted to be free to fulfil certain purposes. It was the purposes that mattered, and freedom from hindrances was but the necessary condition. Men rallied to a charter always more readily than to a demand for freedom. No one was urged to strive for freedom for the mere purpose of being free, but for the purpose of fulfilling a law. It was for liberties rather than liberty that men would die. It was rather the things men wanted to do that interested them, things for which they had to seek liberty from oppressions and curtailments of one form and another.

In contrast to this liberty for good, modern liberalism has proclaimed freedom in its own right. It has been freedom *from* something, instead of freedom *for* something. To quote what I have written elsewhere:

> Democracy has demanded liberty for the expression of the "will of the people," when that will had lost all object except liberty and its own activity. But, as Nicolas Berdyaev insists, one cannot liberate man in the name of human liberty, for man cannot be the end of man.

* Bede Jarrett, *Social Theories of the Middle Ages*, chap. iv.

"Democracy does not want to know in the name of what the will of the people is expressed and does not want to subordinate the will of the people to any superior end. As soon as Democracy defines the end towards which the will of the people should reach, when it discovers an object worthy of its will, when it becomes filled with a positive substance, it will have to place this end, this object, this substance, above the formal principle itself of the expression of its will, it will have to admit them as the basis of society. But Democracy knows only the formal principle of the expression of the will of the people to which it clings above everything and which it will subordinate to nothing. . . . The ideology which affirms the supremacy and autocracy of the will of the people appears when there is no longer a popular will." (Berdyaev: *The End of Our Time.*)

Liberty and the formal act of popular willing have, then, in the consciousness of modern man, been given precedence over the human object for which liberty and willing may be required. The soul of man, having nothing to will, wants only more willing, makes up for the lack of an object by more intensive willing and becomes aggressive. So on the one hand the will of humanist man has been turned upon the ruthless exploitation of nature, and on the other hand upon distinguishing itself from other wills—and man becomes an individualist, nationalist, and so on. The heresy of the modern world has been that there can be no sovereignty, liberty, or independence which is not absolute. And the political history of this period has been a struggle between various embodiments of the absolute will.*

In Christian theology only God's will is perfect, and therefore absolute. Man's freedom of choice is given in his nature, but it is an imperfect freedom; the freedom of realizing his true end is to be found only in God, for man has not the law of his own being within himself. Humanism and Liberalism tried to give man a status by according him an absolute sovereignty in the real world—cut off from God, the Cosmos, the Community, the Church.

But man has by his nature as creature a dependence upon God and other creatures. In the Catholic tradition his dependence upon God is mediated by his dependence upon other creatures, material, human, and spiritual. Hence springs the Catholic organic outlook upon reality in which man is on the confines of the two worlds of necessity and freedom. The atomism induced by the severance which the Enlightenment made by cutting man out of any organic relation to the rest of reality also cut into him, and has left him an empty man with liberty to do all things and nothing particular to do. He has been left, not magnificently human, autonomously human, but cravenly wriggling under conflicts between the claims of various parts of his nature, each of which seeks to wrest autonomy from him. Because he could not give himself to something more than human, he has had to give himself as a slave to some frac-

* *God, Man and Society*, chap. vi.

tion of humanity. The human panorama of the last two centuries has presented us, not with a pageant of free and kingly lords of creation, but a succession of ghosts, the economic man, the rational being, the self-expressive artist, a stone in the social edifice, the crown of biology, the chosen-race bearer—idols which have enslaved the whole man. "When the will abandons the higher," writes St. Augustine, "and turns to what is lower, it becomes evil, not because that is evil to which it turns, but because the turning itself is perverse!" And St. Thomas Aquinas: "By sinning, man departs from the order of reason, and consequently falls away from the dignity of his manhood, in so far as he is naturally free and exists for himself, and he falls into the slavish state of the beasts *by being disposed of according as he is useful to others.*"

In brief, whenever men seek only freedom *from* something, freedom of choice, subjective freedom, they always put themselves at the mercy of whatever secular forces happen to be dominant at the time. Having no purpose for which liberty is striven for, there is no criterion by which to judge the interests which make use of such freedom as exists. And because man is by nature purposive as well as initially free, he cannot endure to be left with this freedom only, and he soon gratefully gives himself over to any Moloch of secular might who claims him. Luther's "Liberty of a Christian Man" was so subjective that the configuration of social life was allowed by him to be set by the interest and will of the princes. "A Christian man is the most free Lord of all, and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to everyone." This extreme antithesis between the interior and external life means that there is no means of opposing the ruler, for there is no concern to relate the social order to the end of man's freedom.

By Luther's utter separation between the Natural Law and the Gospel the way was paved for interpreting the Law of Nature in a sense of pure expediency and utilitarianism. It is not a far step from this to abolishing all higher law by which the powers that be may be checked. Machiavelli took this step. For him the State is an end in itself, and in Hegel it takes the place of God as the end of man. Lutheranism did not cut man off from God, but he made the relation so purely interior to man that human relations and social living had no place in a mediated organic scheme of redemption without which there is no purpose by which social and political life can be judged. By seeking a subjective liberty—in origin a freedom from ecclesiasticism—Luther began a trail that ended in political absolutism. Man must give himself to something other than himself and to a deity in whom his worldly relations can be organically ordered to a

spiritual end. By seeking freedom rather than an object for freedom, this tendency has made possible totalitarian results that would have horrified the great reformer.

Calvin did not seek liberty, but the perfection of a state which would be a Church. And in resisting all obstacles which stood in the way of a uniform system, Calvinism won liberties against civil authorities and developed powerful pleas against despotism. By the doctrine of God as absolute sovereign will, irrational, without insistence upon the nature of God, man's life in God became a relation of pure timeless acts of response *in any worldly situation*. The worldly situation has no place in the transformation of redemption. The Predestined Man is redeemed out of it, and free to fulfill his calling in it. This finds expression in the sense of personal responsibility and activism in the world with a spirit of discipline and independence of all that is "creaturely." There follows a detached and aloof manner of handling all that is secular and creaturely, solely with reference to secular purposes, which extends to all merely secular and natural personal relationships. The secular good is the product of the relative Natural Law; social institutions are for the purpose of preserving social peace and harmony. They are means only for the maintenance of true religion. The dismissal of secular good from any mediating and organic relation between man and his salvation, the cutting of the tension between the secular and the spiritual, and encouragement to man to be active with a good conscience in any social order, opened the door to an unrestricted victory for some of the secular interests that threatened to dominate the whole of man's life. By the circumstances of the struggle freedom was won from the political arm; but the more biological elements of social life—namely, economics—slipped out from all direction by any conceptions of higher law. In consequence, economic life itself soon ceased to be socio-biologically understood and became more atomic and mathematical. Consumption and production ceded priority to trade, and trade to money-lending. Man became a function of the ledger. As a recent brilliant book puts it: "We have elaborated a system to produce, distribute, and consume large *numbers* of things bereft of personal or creative meaning, to regulate the *time* and *energy* needed, and to express these physico-mathematical relations in terms of *arithmetic*. If patriotism, art, religion, a sense of sin or other irrelevance confuse the mathematical account, we strain all the definitions of our system to bind the individual, state, empire, race, in a flawless set of ratios. We save labour (space, time, energy) with a view to saving space, time, and energy. We save money (arithmetical ratio) in order to preserve the ratio. We calculate the peace of the world in

terms of arithmetic, measure governments by their effects upon exchange, drive business on a mathematically determined credit, and steer it with the mathematics of profit and loss. Space, time, energy, motion, mass, number, are the form under which we have achieved the vast mysterious incorporation of the human race."*

The slide from Catholic Natural Law to the Natural Rights of the Enlightenment not only dismissed super-nature and sin, it has ended by dismissing in the consciousness which governs life even nature itself. We are governed by abstractions and ruled by those who make them. A perusal of Dr. Ernest Barker's translation of Otto von Gierke's *Natural Law*, and Troeltsch's Essay printed along with it, makes clear that the romantic tradition behind the present tendencies in Central Europe are in open revolt against the atomic and mathematical configuration of liberal commercialism.†

It is a struggle of organic conceptions against atomic ones.

III

It is largely the disintegration in the economic life of the liberal world which has given rise to the frustrations that are sending whole populations to seek a meaning for life in secular totalitarian conceptions. Secular life as a whole had come to be motived more and more by expediency and efficiency: its true end was supposed to be contained in the process of secular history itself. There was no divine law to which men could appeal in deciding whether economic and political life were pursued to an end beyond their own activity. The divine law spoke to man in timeless acts, indifferent to history, political structure, economic methods, and so forth. Man became the slave of those who succeeded in squeezing life into a means for their own specialized activities. Man came to be regarded first as political subject, then as economic producer, then as eating to encourage trade, as consumer to help industry, and as interest-earning debtor. Along with the delusive victory of nominal political freedom, he has been enslaved to a series of totalitarianisms built upon segments of human life.

Modern humanism cut man off from any law except that of his own being. The inevitable result is that he becomes a lackey of some instrumental activity of his existence. The religious influence of theological Protestantism, while theoret-

* T. S. Gregory, *The Unfinished Universe*, chap. v. (Faber).
† *Natural Law and the Theory of Society* (Cambridge).

ically in conflict with Humanism, has given up any power to challenge it. Liberal Protestantism has identified itself with it. When the relation between man and God is subjective, interior (as in Luther) or in timeless acts and logic (as in Calvin), man's utter dependence upon God is not mediated through the concrete facts of his historical life. His motives only, not the nature of his activities, are matters of judgment and transformation. The "face to face" duality between man and God—in contrast to the hierarchical conceptions of Mediæval Catholicism—in which divine omnipotence and pure logic are the only foundations, leaves no room for a dependence and a responsibility in regard to the structure of social living. The abstract objectivity of God is no antidote to the subjectivism of the humanist era. There is only one step from glorifying God and annihilating man, to glorifying man and annihilating God, and man takes that step in his sleep. The absolute freedom which individualist liberalism has claimed has been the liberty of the autonomous individual. It has been encouraged by the religious conceptions which have regarded man's dependence and responsibility as to God direct, unmediated through his social purposes and environment. Where the God and man relation is cut off from man's other relations, where there is no hierarchy of human purposes with its meaning in the eternal world, there are no norms for resolving the violence in the conflicts of interest in earthly relations. Deification of the ego and of the human activity becomes possible in practice, however much the individual is conceived as dependent upon the Creator. Taking man out of the organic scheme of things, in which he is both dependent and responsible, leaves him swinging between conceptions of absolute impotence and absolute independence. Disillusioned about his liberty of choice, of movement, he gives himself to some collective or historical idol. The "wholly other" God soon drops out, and we are left with humanism, étatism, racialism, class consciousness, the national idea—false absolutes which claim the place left empty by the disappearance of theological conceptions in which the human purposes they represent are ordered hierarchically with their end in God. It is significant that present-day totalitarianisms are not proclaimed in the name of the State, though political absolutism is an *ad hoc* means. They are proclaimed in the name of some element in the historic process which gives an object for man's activities. It may be the Proletarian Class of Communism, the National idea of Fascism, the Blood, Race, and Folk destiny of National Socialism. In all cases it is an effort of the collective soul to supply an atomistic society with a form of *libertas major* in which man is supposed to find that his service is perfect freedom. This heresy

of deifying an historical process which now threatens personal freedom is the revenge of the soul of man upon religion of all modern Churches.

IV

The only force strong enough to conquer secular totalitarianism is a spiritual totalitarianism. Liberalism proclaimed the individual as a totality. Hegel and the modern totalitarians proclaim the State, Class, or Race as a totality. They are in the place of God. Man is taught to find his being in them. The freedom for which the Church is responsible cannot be upheld as a freedom *from* these false totalitarianisms—the *libertas minor*—whether of individual or Church body. It must be proclaimed as the freedom for man to realize his nature. Secular totalitarianism is perceiving a truth that liberalism lost—namely, the truth of the *libertas major*, that man is not his own law and finds fulfilment only in relations to the ground of reality. Contemporary totalitarianism is false because it subjects the person to only one layer of reality—a purely this-world reality. The freedom for which the Church can fight is the freedom of the person to be a person. A person is not an atom, nor is he a drop in the stream of terrestrial history. He is from beyond history and society and state and race. He is a person *sui juris*, an absolute in his way, relative only to God. He is more of an end than any arrangement of creatures. But this "personality," which makes him an end in relation to social, economic, and political means, is grounded, not in the fact of his totality, which is an illusion, but in his membership of a world at right angles to the mundane world. In this hierarchic world he is a person by virtue of his roots in God and by virtue of his responsibility to order his terrestrial arrangements as ministers of that eternal order. He therefore can claim freedom to be a person. By sin he turns his means into ends. Redemption effects a *metanoia*, a turning round. The Church's bid for freedom has to be a message that this is a possibility for all men.

It must, however, be a turning round, a response, which carries with it a re-ordering of the activities of men and their concrete relationships, not an interior or abstract redemption out of them. For man is in history, though not absolutely. And his historic relations have to find a place in redemption. Calvin and Rousseau, whose twin statues dominate the Mecca of modern humanism, both dismissed history from the sphere of significant reality, the one by relegating it to a world of means and expediency, the other by an interpretation of natural rights independent of positive, concrete situations. The roman-

tic spirit has taken vengeance. The good is to be identified with "the State," which in practice means the "history of this people." "Who dares," cries Bergmann, "to pass by blindfold six centuries' history of the German spirit and impose upon us Germans even today the non-Germanized Jewish God of creation who rewards and punishes?" It is a call back to the organic conceptions of the ancient and mediæval world, away from the arid atomism of the Natural Law of the Enlightenment and the inorganic religious dialectic of God and the soul in post-Renaissance Christianity.

The religious completeness which alone can recover freedom must contain insistence upon both man's being in the eternal world, with the dialectic there involved between God and man, and man's organic and concrete place in this world, which is affected objectively in this world by his relation to God. This religious basis of freedom demands a balanced tension between the two elements which have broken asunder in the modern era, both of which were held in somewhat unstable equilibrium in their mediæval form as Natural Law and organic relationships. The Enlightenment fastened upon the first and severed it from its religious context and from the fact of sin which reverses its true order; present-day totalitarianism fastens on the second, also in isolation from a supernatural order which checks its absolutism. The fight for freedom just now is in resistance to this last tendency, and it must embody the truth of which this tendency is a false expression. The Communist declares freedom to be "the consciousness of necessity." The Christian claim for freedom from terrestrial absolutisms can only proceed effectively from *the necessity* of a more real world than they represent. This more real world is the world of God and man, of creation, of sin and redemption: a world in which man is both above history and in it, which is expressed politically in conceptions of Justice (not liberty) above the laws and arrangements of particular societies; and also the spiritual significance of particular events, moments, and social structures. We cannot surrender either truth, for life demands them both.

To reclaim the freedom which man must have from submergence in social absolutisms, the Church's task is to claim it, not in the name of freedom, but in the name of man's necessity to find his *good* in the eternal world; and that in this good is embodied his freedom to order the social structure to that spiritual end of his.

V. A. DEMANT.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND ETERNAL LIFE

If we consider the Scriptural foundations for belief in eternal life, we are met with three rather surprising facts. The first is what has been called (by Salmond in his *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*) the "dim and fragmentary conception of immortality" possessed by the Old Testament. There is, indeed, a negative value in this lack of stress on the Hereafter. As G. A. Smith tells us, "the Old Testament is of use as reminding us that the hope of immortality is one of the secondary and inferential elements in religious experience." Yet when we think of the large place which belief in immortality occupies in Christian faith and life, and in human thought generally, it is somewhat surprising to find so little belief in it in the hearts of the saints and seers of ancient Israel.

The second remarkable feature of the Biblical Doctrine of the Future Life is that it seems to contain two strands of belief—viz., eternal life in God begun here and consummated hereafter, and the life beyond the grave following a resurrection. Dr. Nairne, in his book *Eternal Life: Here and Now*, says definitely "there are two lines: eternal life in God, and a life beyond the grave," and he adds: "In the Old Testament and New . . . the two lines come together. Yet not as equals. Eternal life dominates" (pp. 33, 34). Later in his book he illustrates it thus: "'The God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob is not the God of the dead, but of the living: all live unto him'—the line of eternal life; 'Brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees: touching the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question'—the line of life beyond the grave and personal immortality" (*op. cit.*, p. 165).

The Creed itself seems to endorse this dualism in its affirmation of belief in "the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting."

Thirdly, we should not, after this, expect to find a clear-cut doctrine of immortality in the Bible; indeed, there may be expressions in which, as Archbishop W. Temple says, "here and there a relapse into the Hellenistic point of view may be detected" (*Nature, Man and God*, p. 463). He is thinking of the Greek conception of the natural immortality of the soul. Perhaps the words of Wisdom ii. 23 are an example of such a lapse into Greek ways of thought: "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of His own eternity." It is arguable that the frequent reading of Wisdom ii. and iii. in the public

services of the Church since the war encourages thoughts about the Future Life which are less than fully Christian.

What, then, is the specifically Christian belief in regard to eternal life?

(1) It is a doctrine of God, not of the natural immortality of the human soul. Why do we really believe in eternal life for the individual? Is it not because we believe that God cares so much for the individual soul that He will not willingly let it perish? Religious experience "tells us of a God who created us because He hungered for our love and service, and therefore cannot throw us aside like so much rubbish when we die; and in loving Whom we are in touch with something indestructible . . . with a Person who lets us 'feed upon' His Immortality" (Brabant and Hartill, *Faith and Truth*, p. 185). The Creed, which begins with belief in God, ends with belief in life everlasting. "God so loved . . . that whosoever believeth . . . should not perish, but have eternal life." Here, surely, is the underlying force of the argument used by our Lord "as touching the dead, that they are raised": God is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of the individual soul; "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." As Dr. John Baillie says: "The argument is unanswerable. . . . If the individual can commune with God, then he must matter to God; and if he matters to God, he must share God's eternity. . . . It is in the conjunction with God that the promise of eternal life abides" (*And the Life Everlasting*, p. 137).

Man has no natural right to immortality; the immortality of the soul in virtue of its own essential nature is not a Christian belief. (Contrast with this the statement of Canon Vernon Storr, *Christianity and Immortality*, p. 169: "The New Testament, it is certainly true to say, teaches that man is essentially an immortal being.") The assertion in Genesis that man was made in the image of God, a phrase upon which large theological structures have been built in the past, would today be interpreted probably as implying that man possessed reason and conscience, but hardly that he was naturally immortal. It is significant that the word immortality, *ἀθανασία*, only occurs twice in the New Testament: once in 1 Tim. vi. 16, where we read of God "who only hath immortality"; and again in 1 Cor. xv. 53, where we are told that "this mortal must put on immortality." Immortality, therefore, is inherent only in God; we have to put it on, or receive it. In Archbishop Temple's phrase, "man is not in his own nature immortal, but he is *capax immortalitatis*"; or, in another phrase, "he is not immortal, but immortable" (*op. cit.*, p. 468).

(2) Christian belief in eternal life is a doctrine of Christ

and the Resurrection, not of mere soul survival. Here we come to the second of the two strands of which the Biblical teaching on eternal life is composed. God's love for the individual soul ensures its immortality, if that soul but responds to His love. Christ's Resurrection from the dead assures us that the eternal world is peopled, not by ghosts, but by "the spirits of just men made perfect," when "what is mortal" has been "swallowed up of life." To quote Dr. Baillie again: "The grounds of our Christian persuasion of the reality of eternal life may be . . . accurately expressed by means of an adaptation of our Lord's own words: 'But as touching the dead that they are raised, have ye not read that God is the God of our Lord Jesus Christ? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living'" (*op. cit.*, p. 155). More than that, the Resurrection helps us to believe in the transformation of nature and the consummation of all good in man. Let me quote a passage from a little book by Dr. Hardman, which deserves our Easter reading. After repeating a passage from a sermon by F. D. Maurice, the writer continues: "There is no doubt that for Maurice, as for St. John, eternal life begins here and now. He was always ready to lay great emphasis on the truth of present redemption and newness of life. But there can be no doubt also that he looked for the consummation, and that the true and final resurrection of the body was viewed by him as a part of that consummation which is the transformation of the natural order . . . every form of evil, decay and death being banished, and the beauty and glory of the Creation being perfectly declared. The primrose and the almond tree, the arch of the rainbow and the song of the blackbird, the devotion in the eyes of a dog, the laughter of children and the patter of tiny feet, the strong hand-clasp of reunited friends, the prayer-laden lips of good mothers, and the white hairs and grave dignity of venerable old age—all these will be found in heaven, with every other good thing that belongs by right to the Kingdom" (*The Resurrection of the Body*, p. 92). One would not wish to speak disrespectfully of any sincere search for truth, but compared with this Christian doctrine of Resurrection and Regeneration, how trivial seem even the assured results of the labours of those who seek to prove by psychical research that the soul survives!

(3) From the fact that the full Christian belief in life eternal is based on belief in the love of God and the Resurrection of Christ, it follows that the Agent of our risen and eternal life is the Holy Spirit, the Life-Giver. Let us recall the fact of the two-strandedness of the New Testament conception. "Eternal life," says Dr. A. H. McNeile in his book *The Problem of the*

Future Life, "is viewed in the New Testament from two points of view . . . the eschatological and the mystical, the one of future time, the one of timeless and eternal quality" (p. 106). The Fourth Gospel, which is usually thought of as presenting only the latter view, in fact presents both. "The hour cometh, in which all that are in tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment" (John v. 28, 29)—there is the future, eschatological, resurrection idea. "This is life eternal, that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (John xvii. 3)—there is the present, mystical, eternal-life idea. What for our present purpose is to be strongly emphasised is that it is the Holy Spirit who is the effective Power creating the risen and eternal life. "It is the presence of the intrinsically immortal, Eternal Spirit within us that constitutes our surety of immortality, ever accompanied, in St. Paul's conviction, by the resurrection of the body" (Von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, p. 70). "He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 11). "He that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life" (Gal. vi. 8).

We must not, however, regard these as two diverse conceptions, incompletely welded together in the New Testament. Both the Resurrection life and eternal life are gifts of God: "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." Both thoughts are present in two transcendent sayings of our Lord. "I am the Resurrection and the Life." "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Let us examine a little more closely the relation of the Eternal Spirit and the eternal life. There is, this side of death, the risen life lived by Christians in the power of the Spirit: "If you then were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above." "Resurrection," writes Canon Quick, "stands for the law of gain through loss, of realization through sacrifice. . . . And the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ are profoundly sacramental in that they form both the representative case of the operation of that divine law, and also the means by which it works effectively for the redemption and salvation of the world" (*The Christian Sacraments*, p. 93). "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" makes us "free from the law of sin." Here is the first stage of the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to eternal life, the lifting up of the natural life into union with Christ, so that here and now is begun that risen and eternal life, "the life which is life indeed."

But death supervenes upon all and every life. "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" makes us "free from the law" not only of sin, but "of death." Death may be, and in the case of the mature Christian often is, an offering of the self through the Spirit to God. So was it with our Lord, "who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God." We take with us through the grave and gateway of death, not an indestructible soul, but an accumulation of spiritual treasure, "the fruit of the Spirit"; so do we gather fruit "unto life eternal." With life beyond the grave our difficulties of thought commence and never end, mainly because we have to employ terms of space and time in a sphere in which they do not apply. There are at least three values in the New Testament in relation to eternal life "beyond" which we should wish to preserve, and which our Creed does in fact preserve: (i.) The completion of the work of the Spirit in the individual life, the sanctification of the whole man: "I believe in the resurrection of the body." (ii.) The incorporation of each sanctified life into the Society of the Redeemed, for "there can be no complete consummation for the individual until there is consummation also for society" (Baillie, *op. cit.*, p. 249): "I believe in the communion of saints." (iii.) Less certainly, a renovation of the natural order, a "restoration of all things," a "new heaven and a new earth," a hope that "the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God," a hope to which Scripture testifies, but which the Creed does not make explicit unless we look for it in the words, "I look for . . . the life of the world to come."

It is almost impossible to be engaged in these thoughts about the Hereafter without the question insistently presenting itself: Is eternal life for all or only for some? It is a question which we have not knowledge enough to answer, for the answer to it depends on two unknown factors: the working of the Spirit in the heart of man and the response of man to the love of God. We may truly say that God offers eternal life to all, for He "willeth that all men should be saved"; and in that "all" we must include all that ever lived before Christ, and all that, living since His day, have never been faced with His claim. "To every soul of man at all times and in all places that Word, which Christians know as Jesus Christ, has spoken and is speaking; and the answer that arises in their hearts is fashioned by the inspiration of His Spirit" (Temple, *op. cit.*, p. 417). But we cannot know whether some will not ultimately, after the fullest probation which Eternal Mercy can give, reject "for themselves the counsel of God."

If we may try to summarize these thoughts in the simplest terms we might say: God has made man a being capable of immortal fellowship with Himself; man attains to this fellowship through the help of God's Spirit, who enables man to respond to God's desire for man's love and service. The Spirit works universally in the heart of man, not only since the days of Christ, or within the Christian Church, to prepare men for fellowship with God; but that work is rendered immeasurably easier when the ground has been prepared through the grace and truth of Jesus Christ. This gaining of eternal fellowship is begun in this life and continued in the next, and involves the consummation of the whole man and of the whole fellowship of the redeemed, and probably the regeneration of the whole natural order.

E. H. DUNKLEY.

PASTORALIA

I

IN his February notes the Editor remarked that he did not receive articles on Pastoralia. This gives food for thought, for Pastoral Theology is surely, to the English clergy especially, not the least important branch of that study to which this Review is devoted. In England we have inherited a great pastoral tradition, and in the past have numbered among our theological writers many names honoured not least for their labours in expounding, upholding, and propagating the true pastoral method and spirit. Books on Pastoralia are still, it is true, being written, but scarcely with the authority and acceptance of former days; and articles, apparently, are not being written. Yet pastoral work, good or bad, old-fashioned or newfangled in method, goes on, or at least is attempted. It is suggested here that, in fact, what is required is a re-writing of Pastoral Theology. What Kirk has begun to do for English ascetical theology, Thornton and others for Dogmatics, someone must do for Pastoralia. Why ?

(*a*) The old books (and many fairly recent in date, but written by the older men) assume for the clergy's life and work in parishes a state of things which has largely passed away. To begin with, they almost all take for granted that a parish has a "staff." But over very large areas, and particularly in the North, parishes have no staff—they only have one priest living and working alone. Quite a considerable amount of the old

advice, the old methods, the old mapping-out of the field of work, is rendered useless by this one consideration alone. Nor is the end of this condition of understaffing in sight.

(*b*) New factors in the life of the people, though they have received notice in stray debates here and there, have not been faced up to in any book on parish life and work known to the writer. A few such factors are the vastly increased mobility of the people due to cheap cars, cheap buses, the revived craze for cycling, the return of cheap railway-fares; the vastly increased opportunities for occupation of all sorts—evenings filled with wireless, pictures, schools, classes.

(*c*) The new outlook. This means the almost total disappearance of the Victorian conception symbolized by the frock-coat of the clergy. Our generation does not take it for granted that religion, or the activities of the Church, have any place in the scheme of things. That place must be won, not assumed.

(*d*) Much of what constituted a "strong Church life" has already disappeared, and hence whole chapters of Pastoralia dealing with it are out of date. Men's clubs, for example, are largely replaced by the British Legion, Toc H, unemployed centres, Rotary, and so on.

In fact, much of Pastoralia, the craft of the shepherd of souls, needs to be replaced by the consideration of the craft of the evangelist.

II

The re-writing of Pastoralia cannot even be attempted in the space possible for such an article as this—even were the writer capable of undertaking it. Nothing more than prolegomena can be offered here. But such prolegomena may perhaps have value in leading someone really qualified to begin the task, for it does seem a pity that books should still be written upon pastoral methods which are vitiated from the start by the neglect of those elements in the new situation which have been set out (not exhaustively) above.

Let us, in order to provoke thought and pave the way for the desired manual envisaging these altered conditions of our vocation, consider the effect of the changed character of English life in certain topics usually dealt with in books on Pastoral Theology. Such books will generally include chapters on the personal life of the clergy, or the use of time, arrangement of the day and duties, and so on. Then on visiting, teaching, Church services, with perhaps a chapter or section on children's work and classes for Confirmation and Communion. And nearly always the underlying assumption is there—of a parish with

a staff, a population waiting to be shepherded; in fact of Church life as it was in pre-war days, and is not now.

The Prayer Book takes for granted in its occasional notes the parish of a few hundred souls which was the norm in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It assumes, *e.g.*, that the parish priest can and will know all the families in his parish. If he notices that a mother has not brought her child to Baptism, he will point out that it should be brought within a month of birth. If he notices that his parishioners do not frequent Holy Communion, he will exhort them to it. Baptism is to be administered on Sundays and Holy Days—quite possible with the number likely to occur in a parish of a few hundred souls. The pastoral office was a real possibility with the proportion of clergy to population in those days.

But the nineteenth century changed all that, and at any rate towards its end the Church made real efforts to restore the balance by having two, three, or even more "assistant curates" to help the "persona" of the parish. In the country districts the Prayer Book ideal still largely remains as a realizable proposition. In the towns, suburbs, new housing estates, not only has it gone, but the counterbalancing weight of the assistant curates is now quite inadequate. The Pastoralia of today must envisage things as they are—and that is not as they were in 1662, nor as they were in even 1912.

III

We begin with the topic of visiting. The young curate often aimed at in books on pastoral work is generally therein reminded that "a house-going parson makes a Church-going people," and exhorted to diligent visiting on some systematic plan. Many of us who began our work twenty or more years ago remember well that conscientious Vicars were accustomed to require of us a list of thirty or forty houses visited each week, to be presented at the staff conference on Monday mornings. Most young curates of today find themselves even at first with a district or parish so large that house-to-house visitation of the old kind makes no real impression on it, and in a few years, very few in comparison with what used to be, find themselves in charge single-handed of a parish or new area. It should frankly be recognized that in the majority of cases the old way is impossible, and should not be advocated. Thirty or forty visits a week by two curates, plus what a Vicar could also do, made a big impression on a fairly stable population of, say, 5,000 to 7,000 people. In the parish in which I worked from

1909 to 1916 there were few families unknown to the staff. How many parishes of 6,000 or 8,000 can boast of two curates today?

Or, again, take the method sometimes advocated of beginning with contacts made through baptism, marriages, etc., and following them up. This, in a parish of 8,000 with one priest, cannot be done. Or, again, sick visiting. The intensive care of each case possible with three on the staff, each with the charge of ten or fifteen cases, is impossible to the single-handed priest who has all the thirty or forty in the parish.

Faced with such impossibilities, to which, nevertheless, the accepted mentors urge them, many clergy are tempted to give up systematic visiting altogether. Today it is quite common to hear clergy say frankly that they do not visit. Yet the welcome still generally afforded the clergy of the English Church in English homes is the direct legacy of the effective visiting of the past. It is a valuable asset, not lightly to be thrown away.

Are there any possible ways of keeping some at least of the gains of visiting even under the new conditions? We are visualizing here what has become almost the normal parish in industrial England or new housing estates—a population of up to 7,000 with one priest, or over 10,000 with only two.

I believe that, first of all, "shewing the flag," as the Navy has it, is useful. Time may be scanty, reaching every house hopeless. But steady visiting achieves something, and if every part of the parish, though not every house, gets its turn, at least the Church flag is shewn, the parson's face and form are not quite unknown, and in need he will not utterly be a stranger.

Then, next, take the sick. What seem likely to be long or chronic cases might be taught to look after themselves (apart from Communion) by giving them schemes of reading and prayer.

Again, contacts impossible by older methods may be made through Rotary, British Legion, Toc H. I know a parish where a generation's-old feud between Church and Dissent is being healed through contact on the neutral ground of the Rotary Club.

But this is not much. The first thing is re-orientation. We must grasp the fact that it will not do merely to shepherd the faithful; we must find means of going out to the unclaimed thousands. "There are certainly times when the proper work of the Church is intensive cultivation. But the jungle is now encroaching on the garden" (Lacey). The phrase about a vicious circle is hackneyed, and not always accurate. Here we seem to have a real case of it. Understaffed parishes mean unconverted people, unconverted people mean fewer vocations to the ministry and less money for curates, fewer vocations

and less money mean worse understaffing and more unconverted people. How is this truly vicious circle to be broken ?

It cannot be done by the individual parish priest. But we suggest it is an urgent need for the headquarters of the Church to consider. England is largely today a country needing missionary methods. What the first friars did needs doing again. Instead of asking for sixpences we must ask for lives—for men and women like those in some Roman Catholic orders who will, without pay, devote themselves to evangelization and teaching. This sounds heroic, a counsel of perfection. But many of us in the parishes feel that nothing less than heroic measures can save the situation. "The jungle is encroaching on the garden."

IV

Our next topic is teaching, and this, of course, includes day- and Sunday-school work, Confirmation work, and preaching.

Our day-schools year by year hold fewer and fewer of the nation's children. The closing of old schools, reorganization on "Hadow" lines, above all, enormous new housing areas where neither funds nor regulations give much hope of new Church schools being built in numbers adequate to the population, combine to bring it about that an even smaller percentage of English children are taught in the schools of the English Church. The desired manual of which we are thinking must take account of this, and instead of merely laying stress on the value of our schools and of being frequently in them, must gather for us expert guidance on ways of meeting the new situation.

SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.—There is a vast change here in the twenty years since 1915. Teachers of the right type are more than ever difficult to find. Children are more difficult to hold. Parents have far less sense of obligation or duty in regard of religion and religious instruction. On the other hand, a great deal has been done to improve Sunday-school methods, lessons, and ideas. But as a branch of pastoral work the Sunday-school system remains a problem, and demands a searching inquiry. Have we ever stopped to ask whether Sunday-schools are, in fact, suitable for the Church's purpose ? Is there not really a fundamental "incompatibility of temperament"? At the root of the Church system lies the ideal that every young member shall, at years of discretion, be confirmed and become a worshipping member of the congregation. At the root of the Sunday-school system lies the idea, not of worship, but of instruction. Sunday-schools were begun with totally different aims from those now pursued in them. They are, at best, a

makeshift. Faced with the greatly enlarged population, perceiving that parents and godparents and masters of apprentices and dames no longer brought their children to be catechized, fearing lest the children be lost altogether, the Church borrowed the Sunday-school idea from the chapel, and tried to graft it on to her system. At one blow the family ideal was killed, parents and godparents got out of their own responsibility by transferring it to the Sunday-school teacher, and general edification and instruction, continued even up to mature years, replaced the training for confirmation and worship. The difference was soon perceived. Attempts were made to link the two—Church and Sunday-school—in a better partnership, attempts often bitterly resented in Northern parishes, where Sunday-schools had achieved a real measure of independence. Such compromises have not really worked well save in exceptional cases. The time is ripe for a reconsideration of the whole position. Long since Bishop Gore laid his finger on the cause of much of our weakness —the fact that we had broken down barriers, and divorced responsibility from privilege, baptizing without real guarantees, and generally offering the blessings of membership without enforcing its claims. We do not only baptize without sufficient safeguards, but we continue to absolve parents and godparents from their duties by providing Sunday-schools as a substitute for that co-operation of parents and parish priests which the Prayer Book throughout assumes as the true method in training the children. Thus, in an age when everything conspires to weaken the family as a unit, the Church joins in the conspiracy. The way back will be long and difficult. How can it be attempted?

CONFIRMATION.—In how many parishes are there really any Confirmation candidates? A candidate is one who comes forward to seek office, or place, or membership. But in our manuals of parish work and in practice *we* do the seeking. And here, again, usually it is assumed that the "candidates" will be "looked up." If exhortations in Sunday-school fail, the curate will visit the home; and if he fails, a call from the Vicar will perhaps do the trick. Eight or nine classes, even perhaps ten or twelve, will be held, and the boys and girls thus secured and instructed usually "get done" as a matter of course. But two weaknesses are apparent. First, under the Sunday-school system only a smallish percentage of them will have been used to morning worship. Many Sunday-schools only meet in the afternoon, and where a morning session is held probably not more, and generally less, than half of the children attend it. Thus the idea of morning worship is strange to them. Secondly, a large percentage come from homes where the parents are not themselves communicants. Need we look further for

the cause of the great leakage among young communicants? Further, the old method of counteracting this tendency to fall away by drafting the newly-confirmed into guilds has largely broken down. Guilds have nearly disappeared, thanks to evening schools, continuation classes, the pictures, etc. In place, therefore, of chapters on how to run guilds, we want chapters on how to deal with the whole situation.

V

We pass over such topics as preaching, since a whole volume would be needed on that alone, were consideration to be given to the new factors in the case—envisaging the ordinary parish where one priest attempts to preach to a small congregation of faithful on the same lines and with the same method (or lack of method) as were taught us for the different conditions of a generation or two back. And the Sunday services and use of the Church we leave also, merely remarking that the liveliest discussion for years at a certain Ruridecanal Conference arose over a paper on the lines of *Theology Reprint*, No. 4, thus shewing that the clergy are at least awake to the fact that the ordinary arrangement of Sunday is now out of date, though they are far from clear as to what is to be done about it.

We conclude this survey with the subject, often put in the forefront of manuals, of the parson's life and day. Doubtless, much of the excellent advice given in many a book remains still useful. But here, too, new factors have come in and must be dealt with.

And first the fact that by a gradual process, in which each step may by itself have seemed justifiable and even good, the energy and time of the parish priest have come to be far too much dissipated upon work (or at least occupations) which take him away from his essential duties.

Not to dwell on such obvious features as the enormous increase in conferences, committees, boards, and such-like, on all of which many of the parish clergy are expected to serve, there are the things within the parish which are nowadays expected of the parson. Church Councils and their committees, magazines, constant demands that he shall hold missionary schools, tutorial classes, and so on—all these tend to multiply, to occupy his evenings, to absorb his energy, and to reduce the time and strength available for the real work of visiting, teaching, and sermon preparation, and, above all, prayer, to which at his ordination he promised to devote himself. We have undoubtedly reached a point where we have too much organization and too much talk. If a comparison were made of the time a single-

handed priest can give to prayer and to organization-work respectively, the result would be startling and disquieting. Nor is it true that he can always help it, or alter the proportion. He cannot, at his peril, refuse to spend his time on such affairs as dilapidations at his house and annual statistics. If he does not attend his Church Council (and often its committees) authority rebukes him, and, indeed, the resulting chaos will take longer to straighten out than the time given to attendance. He may be busy seven days a week, and yet often ask himself how much of that very busy-ness has really served to advance the ends for which he was ordained. The thing, indeed, becomes a drug. His conscience is drugged because he knows he is always working, and much of what he does is supposed to be necessary, and thus becomes an excuse for leaving the much harder work of prayer and study and visiting.

Canon Peter Green has pointed out somewhere that there is much talk of "mobilizing the whole force of the Church" to secure, let us say, peace, or some other great aim. Whereas a visit to a dozen churches on a Sunday morning would reveal a force scarcely large enough, if mobilized, to secure a parish pump. His plea was that the key still lies in the parishes, and everything else comes back to them, and that therefore whatever hinders real parish work should be ruthlessly scrapped.

We saw at the beginning that already we are terribly understaffed. We need not double the weight of that drawback by overwhelming the clergy there are with duties and meetings and organizations which still further reduce the care they can give to their own spiritual life and to their real work. A writer on Pastoralia today, then, should not, as we think, devote space to detailing the things expected of the parson and ways of doing them, but to the ways of becoming spiritual men. Untold good might result if, for a year at least, every conference, committee, and board in the Church of England, from top to bottom, passed a self-denying ordinance that it would not meet, and all the clergy on them devoted the time thus gained to real spade-work in Church and parish.

These notes are not meant to be a cry of despair, nor are they intended to be merely critical or destructive. But as one whose whole ministerial life has been passed in parish work, and who is old enough to remember pre-war conditions and contrast them with those of today, the writer feels that the changes in conditions of life and work have been insufficiently recognized in the sphere of Pastoralia. Great, even revolutionary, alterations have so utterly transformed all the environment of the average parish priest that quite different guidance and help are required. It may be doubted whether the influx of

young ordinands into the ministry each year is really made aware of these problems and taught to cope with them. The clergy to whom they go as deacons are often aware that something very radical has happened. But mostly they are continuing to follow the old round in the old way as well as they can. This comes to be accepted by the new men as all that can be done. Meanwhile "the jungle encroaches on the garden."

C. E. G. SPENCER.

MISCELLANEA

WHITSUNTIDE PROCESSIONAL

("The Rhythm of the Holy Ghost," adapted.)

THE scarcity of processionals, and indeed hymns also, in honour of God the Holy Ghost may be helped by the use of the following. If used as a processional, the Priest begins, either saying or intoning the first verse, which is purposely written in irregular form to act as an introduction. Then the choir and people can sing the rest. It will be found that the words go with "Cœlites plaudant" (E.H. 242). But the tune must be adapted as follows:

Sing the same line of the tune *twice*—*e.g.*:

Life of the ninefold . . .
Stirring the world . . .

And the same with the second—*e.g.*:

Stamping mankind . . .
Grieved by the fall . . .

Then sing the third line of the tune once only:

Keeping in all men . . .

And the short line fits the words without alteration:

Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Come, Holy Spirit, come!
Eternal Bond of Love
Between the Eternal Father and the Son,
By equal glory of Godhead with Them Both,
In simple and essential Unity,
And blessed fellowship of Trinity.

Life of the ninefold Order of the Angels,
Stirring the world with life at the creation,
Stamping mankind with image of the Godhead,
Grieved by the fall of man from God's high calling,
Keeping in all men conscience of Thy Witness;
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Leading the world of old through God's own people,
Uttering mysteries through the holy prophets,
Causing a longing for mankind's Redeemer,
Finding an answer in the soul of Mary,
Filling her with the Son of God Incarnate;
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Strong in Thy presence, shewing God Eternal,
Making us speak in love to God, our Father,
Bringing to all the Life of God in Jesus;
Grant us the faith to know our Lord and Saviour,
Wake in our hearts the longing for His mercy;
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Help us to taste the sweetness of Christ's Passion,
Give us the glory of His Resurrection,
Shew in our lives the might of His Ascension,
Teach us to work and battle for His Kingdom,
"Stoop heaven to earth, and lift the earth to heaven";
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Keep us in strength of mind and soul and body,
Save us from sin which never hath forgiveness,
Shine in our lives with Sacramental glory,
Join us in heavenly union with the faithful,
Burn, in the Church, with zeal for man's salvation;
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

Consecrate soul and body with Thy Beauty,
Stir us to lives of fellowship and service,
Fill us with fire for God's all-loving justice,
Break through our darkness with the Blessed Vision,
Hasten God's triumph in the earth's redemption;
Come, Holy Spirit, come!

PAUL STACY.

VIBRATION IN NATURE AND SUPERNATURE

THE discovery of wireless has emphasized what science has shewn us, that nature is a mass of marvellous and complicated vibrations. Whilst this is becoming very evident in all natural knowledge, it may be of help in illustrating certain great spiritual facts. For the heavenly and supernatural order is of like kind, though in a much greater and deeper sense. It occurred to the writer, when speaking on the relation between the Atonement and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, that nature may here help us in the understanding of grace.

To take the Atonement first: we may suppose, on the assumption of the strictest orthodoxy, that when God and Satan, good and evil, met "in that combat stupendous," a tremendous spiritual vibration resulted which lasts for ever. This description would accord well with the thought in the Apocalypse of the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world, for the Atonement met the mystical anticipation and sealed it. If we look at things thus, we can have a very helpful way of interpreting the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Perhaps it may also help to remove some imperfect thought about the one Death which cannot be repeated, and the perpetual representation of it before God the Father. For if that Death did set up the spiritual

vibration to which reference has been made, then in every Eucharist we are "tuned in" with Calvary, time being no hindrance to the eternal facts of the spiritual world. We actually do offer the Body and Blood of Christ which were offered on the Cross, though that act could never be repeated in time.

PAUL STACY.

A NOTE ON THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

THE present developments of neo-pagan religion in Germany are sufficiently disturbing, but not such novelties as they appear to be. On the contrary, they are all of a piece with the general pattern of Teutonic heterodoxy. Anyone who may chance to turn to the pages of Kurtz's *Kirchengeschichte* and to consult the chapters dealing with the Aufklärung of the eighteenth and the post-Hegelian movements of the early nineteenth century will be startled to find a number of passages which read like descriptions of what is happening at the present moment.

Thus we are told of J. Chr. Edelmann of Weissenfels, who in 1735 "began the publication of an immense series of writings in a rough but powerful style, filled with bitter scorn of positive Christianity. . . . He regarded himself as a helper of Providence and at least a second Luther. Christianity he pronounced the most irrational of all religions; Church history a conglomeration of immorality, lies, hypocrisy, and fanaticism; prophets and apostles bedlamites; and even Christ by no means a perfect pattern and teacher. *The world needs only one redemption—redemption from Christianity.** Providence, virtue, and immortality are the only elements in religion. No less than 166 separate treatises came from his facile pen."

In the reign of Frederick I. of Prussia, 1740-1786 (who wished every man to be saved after his own fashion, and was surrounded by French *libre-penseurs*), we are told that "rationalistic pastors spread all over Germany, to preach only of moral improvement, or to teach from the pulpit about the laws of health, agriculture, gardening, natural science, etc. The old Liturgies were mutilated, hymn-books revised after the barbarous tastes of the age, and songs of mere moral tendency substituted for those that spoke of Christ's atonement. . . ." "Crowds of rationalists . . . for seventy years held almost all the professorships and pastorates of Protestant Germany."

Against this movement, pietism of the Halle type entered the lists, yet as late as 1846 heterodoxy was still active and communities called "Friends of Light" were being inaugurated (at Halle, Königsberg, and many other places), of which Kurtz says: "Their services and sermons were void of religion, in which the Bible, the living Christ, and latterly even the personal God, had no place, *but only the naked worship of humanity*."

Again in 1872 the Protestantenverein propaganda connected with Schmidt and Holtzendorff declared "we are still Christians, though our conception of Christianity diverges in many points from that of the second century, and we proclaim a Christianity without miracles and in accordance with the modern theory of the universe."

* The italics throughout are my own.

Of Strauss, who died in 1874, Kurtz writes, however: "The question whether 'we' are still Christians he answers openly and honourably in the negative. . . . The religion of the nineteenth century is *pancosmism*, its gospel the results of natural science with Darwin's discoveries as its bible, its devotional works the national classics, its places of worship the concert rooms, theatres, museums, etc."

I have quoted Kurtz, not because he is a specially attractive historian, but because he is "echt Deutsch," and therefore free from anti-German bias; and it will be evident from the above passage that the special deliverances of Rosenberg, Bergmann, Hauer, and Wirth, are only new varieties of pagan doctrines which have manifested themselves whenever German religious life has worked itself into a ferment. Bergmann's laudation of Goethe as against Luther is far from new, as anyone will see who reads the chapter on Weimar in Lewes' famous biography of the poet.

On previous occasions an orthodox or at least a more moderate liberal Christianity has prevailed over these extravagances, which have always, perhaps, been treated more seriously outside than inside Germany, partly because of their sensational character. But their recurrence would seem to indicate not merely the successive struggles of the unregenerated Central European mind against the efforts of the Christian Church to persuade it to submit to discipline, but perhaps also the unsuitability of ultra-Lutheran twice-born and anti-cultural religion as a creed for once-born and world-affirming temperaments. If this is the case, the lesson would seem worth learning. Catholicism in Germany is no negligible force. It is Evangelical, moderately liberal, and on the whole by no means fundamentalist. We may yet see the recovery of much ground in the Reich by the great Church. The message of that Church fortunately includes no denial of the necessity of the Cross; but the message of Calvary can be proclaimed in such a manner as to awaken a response even in once-born temperaments. What is obviously needed is a form of Christianity which does not negate culture, and which, while putting a curb on excessive forms of nationalism and appreciating the rich heritage of past centuries of Catholicism, gives reasonable liberty to local and national customs and sentiment. The Anglican Church, with all its faults, makes us so familiar in this country with some such synthesis that we are apt to forget how unaccustomed our cousins in Central Europe still are to recognize the possibility of its value for them as well. Can we possibly help them at present—not, of course, in a spirit of patronage, but as those who have been through their own search after a faith, and have somewhat to share?

A. C. Bouquet.

NATIONAL MUSIC

In *National Music* Dr. Vaughan Williams once more gives expression to his well-known views on the value of folk song. Folk song, he says, grew straight out of the needs of the people, and therefore may form a bond of union where the musical tastes of the people may meet. Folk song should, therefore, act as a sort of artistic touchstone. Art, writes Dr. Vaughan Williams, must not be divorced from everyday life. The composer must not shut himself up, but must live with his fellows and make his art the expression of the whole life of the community. The musical

life of a nation is not shewn by the distinguished names which appear on the front page of newspapers, but is found in the music-making in the home, in the schools, and in the local choral societies.

All this is very true, and we must be grateful to Dr. Vaughan Williams for expressing it so lucidly.

There is a very interesting chapter on the influence of folk music on the music of the Church. Dr. Williams asserts quite definitely that Church music derives from folk song, and not folk song from Church music. He cites a number of examples of hymn tunes which are clearly derived from folk tunes. The tune "Helmsley," which is sung to the Advent hymn, "Lo, He comes with clouds descending," is derived from a secular tune, "Where's the mortal can resist Me?" The Passion Choral, which is sung in the English Church to the words "O Sacred Head, sore wounded," is adapted from a love song. "Innsbruck," which is sung to "The duteous day now closeth" and to "O Thou Who dost to man accord," is also an adaptation from a secular love song.

O. R. CLARKE.

CORRESPONDENCE

HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

DEAR SIR,

May I make one or two comments on the editorial note in the May issue of THEOLOGY, concerning the historical value of the Fourth Gospel?

1. My statement, quoted in the note, that the historical value of the Gospel is "practically nil," had reference only to the Gospel as providing us with material for the "biographical Jesus." The context of my article in the February THEOLOGY made this clear. I agree entirely with the words which you quote from Mr. H. G. Wood.

2. The adverb "practically" guards the statement from denying certain historical facts which the Fourth Gospel furnishes—*e.g.*, the day of the Last Supper, where John corrects the Synoptics.

3. The Fourth Gospel has tremendous historical value, in a higher sense of the word. It gives us the most powerful impression of the results of the impact of the whole life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ upon men. From that point of view it is in many ways more important than the Synoptics.

4. In general, the purpose of my article was to take the irreducible minimum of fact that a thorough-going but sane historical and literary criticism will give us, and, by shewing how that historical reality resulted in the apostolic experience, build a doctrine of Christ which will not try to force the history to its own mould, but will yet safeguard the full Catholic faith in one who has come to be known to us in Christian experience as Incarnate Lord, divine as God and human as any man.

W. NORMAN PITTENGER.

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK CITY, U.S.A.
May 5, 1935.

"THE JOURNEY TO EMMAUS"

SIR,

Mr. Swallow, in his note on this subject in THEOLOGY of May, has wisely condemned the view of those who represent our Lord's action at Emmaus as an actual celebration of the Holy Mysteries. Yet I feel that it is impossible to divorce this event from its Eucharistic environment. I do not suggest that this was a "mutilated Eucharist," but simply an ordinary evening meal of a Jewish household, which commenced in the normal way with the breaking of bread. It is generally agreed that the Eucharist finds its origin in the Kiddush, or preferably in the Jewish fellowship meals, and that Jesus had attached importance throughout His ministry to the bond of fellowship, brought into existence by the "breaking of bread" or in other words by the participation in a common meal. The Last Supper was the last and greatest of these fellowship meals, when the ceremony assumed an entirely new significance and importance.

If this view is accepted, then the divergence between Emmaus and the Last Supper cannot be considerable. The Last Supper had only preceded the meal at Emmaus by a few days, and some time must surely have elapsed before the Eucharistic teaching of the Church developed its varied aspects and the rite became finally separated from its Jewish antecedents.

Lastly, some consideration must be given to the suggestion of Maurice Goguel (*L'Eucharistie des Origines à Justin Martyr*, Paris, 1910, p. 194). Is it purely fortuitous that in the account of the journey to Emmaus two things stand out: an explanation of the death of Jesus Christ given to the disciples who had not yet grasped its significance, and the thought of the presence of the Saviour at the meal? If the Evangelist has consciously connected the two ideas in the one passage, then it would seem that he has brought the passage into line with Eucharistic teaching. Maurice Goguel goes so far as to say: "Le récit qu'il donne de la cène présente, en effet, l'eucharistie comme l'affirmation de la nécessité de la mort du Christ et comme l'explication de son efficacité."

Yours faithfully.

H. L. FRANKLIN.

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.
May 14, 1935.

REVIEWS

THE BIBLE AND HELLENISM. By C. H. Dodd. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

This is really two books, or rather one book and a collection of essays on the religious vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism. The collection comes first and is very valuable, since Professor Dodd is one of the few people who have a sufficient knowledge of both Greek and Hebrew to expound the LXX, and to compare it with the Hebrew original. At the present time, when the study of the New Testament is swinging away from Hellenistic mystery-cults to rabbinical Judaism in its quest for the sources of Christianity, such studies are extremely valuable.

Unfortunately I cannot agree with his treatment of the Pauline use of the word δικαιόω and its derivatives. No doubt the LXX use is a combination of the senses "to do justice to" and "to acquit." But St. Paul is a religious genius, who has undergone the experience of conversion and entered on a new life. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that he would change the meaning of the word to express an experience which had no exact equivalent in LXX Greek; the LXX had no need to express the conversion-experience, which was outside its whole outlook. I am quite clear that St. Chrysostom is right in saying that the word means "to make righteous," for the simple reason that if it does not, St. Paul's whole argument against the Law becomes worthless. If the convert has been made righteous with a better type of righteousness than the Law can give, obviously it is blasphemy to insist on his observing the Law. But if he is merely acquitted, it might be a very good thing for him to observe the Law, to prevent him from relapsing into a state of condemnation. It is not entirely a question of the Greek usage, but of whether we are to suppose that St. Paul was able to reason intelligently.

Further, I cannot see how Professor Dodd can justify his statement that the Jews of Egypt, by interpreting Torah as a code or "law" in its ordinary sense, obscured the prophetic type of religion or caused the Biblical revelation to be obscured in a hard or legalistic way. I should have supposed that legalism in so far as it was a vice of Judaism was peculiar to the Pharisees of Palestine at the time of the Incarnation; where "legalism" is to be found in Philo or Wisdom passes my understanding.

The second part is an heroic venture. Professor Dodd has waded through Scott's extraordinary treatment of the *Hermetica* and the *Poimandres* of Reitzenstein, the obscurest of all German scholars. His thesis is that the resemblances between the Hermetic tract and the LXX shew that the former is dependent on the LXX, and is consciously working on the Biblical narrative of creation. Here, as in dealing with the first part, I have nothing but admiration for the thoroughness and caution of Professor Dodd's work. He has recognized how easy it is to mistake accidental similarities for literary connections, and how inevitable resemblances are when two writers are dealing with the same theme. Yet he has not escaped from the pitfall. Thus (p. 115), the resemblances between Ps. xxviii. and Genesis are ascribed to a reminiscence of cosmic mythology. Surely the resemblance is simply due to the fact that the Psalmist is describing a storm at sea, while Hebraic cosmic mythology opens with the wind of God blowing upon a primeval chaos of water; in fact, the Hebrew account of creation was probably inspired by a storm at sea. This is, of course, a detail; but the whole question is one of detail. For the question is whether a number of resemblances, in their cumulative effect, are such as to exclude coincidence and to prove a causal connection. If each resemblance is real, then 100 units of resemblance make 100. But if each resemblance vanishes on closer inspection, the result is nil. I do not mean, of course, that all the resemblances vanish on closer inspection. But many of them do. Thus Professor Dodd tries to find a resemblance between the Old Testament and the preaching of the Poimandres: "O men of earth, who have surrendered yourselves to drunkenness and sleep and to ignorance of God, be sober, cease from your drunkenness," etc. Of course there is a resemblance to the Old Testament prophets; but this is confined to the inevitable use of the metaphors of sleep, drunkenness, etc. The striking point is the essential differences. The Old Testament prophets denounce either the sins of the Jews or the iniquities of the heathen; they never try to convert people. The New Testament has a message of conversion delivered to the Hellenistic world; but it never addresses the heathen in terms of denunciation of this type, except in the curious fragment Eph. v. 14 (and Professor Dodd knows what effect that passage has on Reitzenstein). Such a passage as 1 Cor. xv. 34 is not to the point; it is addressed not to the heathen but to bad Christians. On the other hand, there is a type of missionary propaganda which does use this method of addressing the unconverted, the Orphic teaching parodied by Aristophanes in the *Birds*, 685 *seq*. The denunciatory tone of the passage pro-

ceeds not from the Jewish Scriptures but from the mission-preaching of this type of religion, though possibly such preaching only survived as a literary convention. It is dangerous to isolate the Poimandres from other documents of the same kind.

I fear this review reads rather ungraciously. For Professor Dodd really deserves nothing but praise for a brilliant and yet thorough investigation of the resemblances between the Poimandres and the Hermetica in general on the one hand, and the LXX on the other. Over and over again he makes a strong point; but over and over again I feel that he is pressing a resemblance due to a common origin and background into a direct literary connection. Yet almost every time I recognize that he may be right and that I may be wrong. I would, however, urge that we must treat the Poimandres as a much less coherent document than he thinks; it seems to me to be a conflation of at least two cosmogonies. Further, in the matter of dating, it seems to me dangerous to assume that this sort of writing begins with Posidonius. So far as I can judge Posidonius was a scientific observer of some shrewdness, who also embodied the syncretistic spirit of his age in philosophy (I am sure that Dr. Edwyn Bevan is right here, as against Reinhardt), and if the fragments of Aristobulus "the Peripatetic" are genuine (and there is really no reason for doubting their authenticity, except the belief that a Jewish-Hellenistic cosmogony could not have appeared so early), it is clear that this kind of literature goes back before 150 B.C. And I am sure that we must treat Philo as a museum in which a vast number of undigested lumps of Hellenistic-Jewish philosophy have been thrown together undigested by Philo himself, not simply as an exposition of the philosophy of a single man. Nothing is so badly needed in this field as an investigation of Philo's materials and the use he makes of them. But such an investigation would make it necessary to recognize the extreme difficulty of disentangling direct literary connections as against a common dependence on a widespread literary atmosphere, which may, *inter alia*, have affected the language of the LXX.

But I really want to praise Professor Dodd's work very highly. It is one of the very few books which really grasp the mental climate of Hellenistic Judaism, and for that reason it is of the highest value for students of Christian origins.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF DOM JOHN CHAPMAN, 4TH ABBOT OF DOWNSIDE. Edited with an Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

For some years past, many persons concerned with the theory and practice of the spiritual life have cherished among their more valuable possessions a tiny booklet called *Contemplative Prayer*, printed for private circulation, and signed with the initials H. J. C. It was remarkable for its lucidity, its profound realism, and its psychological insight; and also for a total absence of the devotional jargon commonly used in writing of this kind. All who made use of it, either for themselves or for those who sought their guidance, would probably agree as to the vivid and reassuring light which it cast on experiences not perhaps very rare in themselves, but seldom rightly understood. It was known to some that the writer of this little masterpiece was the Benedictine scholar, Dom John Chapman, afterwards Abbot of Downside; and to a smaller circle—not all of his own communion—that there lay behind it a peculiar understanding of the life of prayer, comparable with that of the great spiritual teachers of the past, and more useful to us because expressed in the language of our own day. Now, with the publication of his "spiritual letters"—amongst which is included the original text of the aforesaid booklet—and the admirable monograph by his devoted friend and secretary, Dom Roger Hudleston, something at least of Dom Chapman's profound and practical teaching will, it is to be hoped, reach a wide public, and help to clear away some of the puzzle and muddle which commonly hangs about discussions of the "problems of the spiritual life."

All great direction of souls is at once traditional in doctrine and original in application. Abbot Chapman's mystical affinities are easily to be traced. He belongs to that group of transcendental realists which includes among others the unknown author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, St. John of the Cross (whose teaching these letters constantly reinterpret in modern terms), and De Caussade, whose works only became known to the Abbot in the last decade of his life, but to whose deep teaching on "abandon" his own views had long been drawing near. The letters now published—though none were written for publication—extend over a period of more than twenty years, and form, on the whole, one of the most important contributions to the study of religious experience which our generation has received. They deal both with the theory and the practice of the contemplative life: the theory in an elaborate theological scheme drawn up for a Jesuit friend, and an article entitled "What is Mysticism?" which is reprinted as an appendix; the practice in the wonderful series of letters of

advice, addressed to priests, nuns, and men and women of the world. An experience lies behind them which included eight months as a Jesuit novice, a period of training at Maredsous under the great Abbot Marmion, the delicate task of bringing the Benedictines of Caldey (" really men of prayer and—thank God—not in the least ritualistic ") into line with the monastic tradition of Rome after their secession to that Church, over three years as Army Chaplain during the Great War, four years at Rome as a member of the Commission for the Revision of the Vulgate, and finally Downside Abbey, where the last ten years of Dom John's life were spent.

The wide knowledge of souls, and of the varying conditions in which the contemplative life may and must develop, which was gained in the course of this career, and through the questioning of the many persons who came to him for advice, gave the Abbot ample material by which to test his doctrine of mystical prayer. It is true, as he insists, that there is " nothing really new " in this doctrine, which, indeed, belongs to the same spiritual school as our old English masterpiece, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and agrees at all points with that of St. John of the Cross. But the combination of freshness, lucidity, humour, and deep spirituality with which it is presented, and the robust, even disconcerting common sense with which it is applied, give these letters a unique place among modern writings of this kind. " I always tell people that our spiritual life must be managed, like the War Office, *on business principles*. We must not waste time deciding on the pattern of a brass button." A consistent " psychology of prayer," at the same time traditional and practical, runs through the correspondence. It takes its departure from the fact that all contemplatives, as the Abbot points out, insist, in the teeth of all doctrinaire psychology, on making a distinction between the " higher " and " lower " parts of the soul. This distinction, he considers, is of primary importance for an understanding of the special phenomena of the life of prayer.

> " A psychologist will talk as if our imagination was our intellect and as if our emotions were our will. But any contemplative will be like St. Teresa, and know perfectly well that there are complete and full distinctions between the upper part and the lower part of the soul."

To the " lower " part belongs " sensitive nature "—emotion, the sense-concomitant of will; and imagination, the sense-concomitant of intellect. In meditation and in the " prayer of the affections " emotion and imagination are deliberately and properly employed. But contemplation—even of the simplest kind—belongs to the " upper part of the soul "; and is marked

by the use of "pure intellect without images, and pure will without emotions." Hence the aridity which often characterizes it, and hence, too, the constant distractions arising from the unoccupied imagination, unless this is kept quiet by the making of "acts," as recommended—though usually without any recognition of the office they are really meant to fill—by writers on "mental prayer." "Acts," "aspirations," and "affections," says the Abbot, are not prayer—they are "a sop to Cerberus, merely crumbs thrown to the imagination . . . nor are any affections which come in the prayer, the prayer. They are concomitants, which make it more human and consoling—and consequently less 'stripping.'" Thus it follows that in the states verging on contemplation, what is actually said matters little. In fact, attention to the meaning of the words may actually spoil the prayer, by detaching the intellect from God. The essence of this "ordinary contemplative prayer" is neither thought nor feeling, but—

> "A very pure and definite and complete conviction that God is everything and that nothing else is worth having. This is the clinging of the will, or intention. It is obviously an act of love; but it doesn't feel like it, because it isn't *felt* at all."

Hence, far from involving the ecstatic delights supposed to belong to the "mystic way," true contemplative prayer is full of distraction, dryness, worry. "It is the prayer of *stripping*; in which all our natural powers are useless, all pleasure is renounced, and we remain naked before God." Yet, when it comes to results—and this is the only test human beings can safely apply—this "bare and dry prayer" does far more to brace and purify than "an explosion followed by a short intoxication."

> "Remember that a distracted prayer is generally more humbling than a recollected prayer—therefore it gives more glory to God and less to us, and we find afterwards that we have got more good."

The Abbot is careful to insist that this simple contemplative prayer is not necessarily "advanced" or reserved for "saintly souls"; nor is it the only path to union with God. He finds, indeed, that some natural contemplatives are very unsatisfactory in other respects; whereas "it seems to me that people can get to very extraordinary sanctity and wonderful love of God and familiarity with Him by the loftier kinds of meditation." Even the more imaginative and romantic type of devotion is not to be discouraged, in spite of the element of illusion it undoubtedly contains, for those who practise it are probably getting by

this path "a good which they would not get in any other way."

"When I am told, for example, that Sister X—— has beautiful visions, but does not keep her rule, I am inclined to reply that, without the visions, she might even keep it less, and might lose all heart."

Each, then, must "pray as they can and not as they can't"; avoiding the self-conscious considerations which are so easily mistaken for humility ("we should *hate* thinking about our own spiritual state") and remembering that those who stubbornly insist on practising a method which does not suit them are "simply like a hen sitting sedately and happily on a china egg." There will be no results; no quickening of life—and the test of prayer's worth is always to be sought in this field, never in the agreeable sensations which may sometimes accompany it. Nor is there any necessary connection between the sort of prayer to which we find we are impelled and the sort of persons we suppose ourselves to be.

"M. has been putting to me the same difficulty as you have done. I replied that I was glad to say I had often the same difficulty myself. One says 'this *abandon*, and this formless prayer, are for advanced souls, whereas I am a pig.' Of course we can't be saints without feeling we are pigs. My answer to her seems to have satisfied her—'*Can* you do anything else? *Can* you choose your path, your prayer, your method, or want of method?' *Solvitur ambulando*. . . . We are not meant to ask ourselves whether we are beginners or 'advanced,' or to find out. I hold to my view that we ought to try to do what we can and not what we can't."

On the whole, perhaps, the most permanently valuable letters of the whole collection—especially to those concerned with the care of souls—will be those in which Abbot Chapman analyzes, with a firm yet most delicate touch, the characteristics of the "nights" of sense and of spirit described by St. John of the Cross, as they are actually experienced by the soul. In one form or another, all who are called to the practice of contemplation will inevitably pass through them; but because they often present themselves in a homely and apparently "unspiritual" disguise, their real nature may not be recognized, and so some of their fruit may be lost. The long letter addressed to a Benedictine nun (p. 57) on the Night of the Spirit and its "perfect normality" is a masterly yet wonderfully gentle and compassionate analysis of this painful and bewildering episode in the soul's progress to God and the way in which it should be met, all expressed in the simplest everyday language, and linked up with the actualities of everyday life. The pain, confusion of mind, darkness, and temptation are not minimized;

but again and again the essential point is brought into the foreground—that this hard education is the only way in which the soul can be "taught efficaciously by God Himself *only to want His Will*," and is therefore to be received as a grace.

"It is dreadfully hard. I am frightfully sorry for you while I write this. . . . Meanwhile, I tell you that it is all right. In the highest part of your soul you know this. But if God wants to try you by the feeling that all is wrong, then nothing that I can say will persuade you that it is right. But it will be all right all the same."

Anglicans of a hypersensitive disposition may, as they read these letters, receive a slight jolt here and there. But these moments are few, and hardly to be noticed over against the privilege of contact with a wise, bracing, humorous, and holy teacher of the deepest secrets of man's communion with God. This book will find its right place upon the shelf beside the letters of direction of Fénelon, St. François de Sales, and De Caussade. It is in their great tradition, and brings that tradition to bear on the circumstances of our twentieth-century life.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

THE CHURCHPEOPLE'S PRAYER BOOK. Joyce and Sons, Newport, Wales. From 1s. upwards.

This book constitutes a new era in Prayer-Book revision. Hitherto the very person for whom the Book of *Common* Prayer was compiled—the plain layman—has been entirely overlooked. Revision has been carried out to suit the exigencies of the priest, the Anglican controversialist, the layman with an amateur knowledge of liturgiology; and the abortive book of 1928 has increased the confusion in the worship of the Church. We have reached a position where everything is an alternative. This may suit the philosopher, but it is the confusion of the layman. Revision may proceed *either* by the approbation of Parliament *or* by canon approved by the Crown. The sacraments may be administered *either* under the forms of 1661 *or* under the forms of 1928. The Sunday psalms may be recited *either* in the daily course *or* by the annual scheme. And within these alternatives are other alternatives, so that Anglican worship has involved our congregations in a complicated calculation of permutations and combinations. The rules called the *pie* have been transferred from the priest to the layman.

It is this merciless sacrifice of the layman that has been the bane of Anglican worship. In the rebellion of 1549 the West Country peasants complained that the new Mass seemed

"like a Christmas game." Why? Because it was a departure from what was customary. The outward differences must then have been comparatively slight, but they were sufficient to arouse violent opposition in a population accustomed to worship by eye and ear in an age when only the few could read or write. And now, when everyone can read and write, a perverse fate seems determined that no one shall be able to find the place. In a general revision of common worship it is right to bring the Anglican liturgy more into accord with the main stream of Western tradition; nevertheless the usual defects of the place of the *gloria*, the mutilation of the canon, the absence of the self-oblation, *in themselves* have very little significance to either clergy or laity.

Unconsciously Anglicans are beginning to feel their way back towards liturgical uniformity. Anglo-Catholics in the *interim* rite have returned towards the model of 1661. There is very little demand among churchmen of any school for the rite of 1928. The whole Church is in fact retreating to the common basis of 1661; and when advance comes it must come from that line, and proceed in concert.

And now comes the *Churchpeople's Prayer Book*. This is a loyal simplification of the Book of Common Prayer, omitting a multiplicity of rubrics and technicalities, and substituting simple directions that he who reads may run. Here the layman at last comes into his own. The text is that of 1661. The print is large, the type is excellent. We could wish that in future the Prayer Book remained as the standard for the clergy, and the *Churchpeople's Prayer Book* was in universal use for the laity. It is almost inconceivable that any thoughtful parish priest would, in buying books for congregational use, choose the ordinary book when he has so useful an alternative. Nor does it appear that the question of authority is involved. What is set forth is the substance of the Prayer Book simplified for the use of the unlearned; any one of the familiar books of eucharistic devotion may still be used in supplement. But meanwhile the plain worshipper has his needs met in a handy and intelligible volume at a price well within the reach of the narrowest purse.

The compilers have used a wise discretion in selection and arrangement. Forty occasional prayers are provided for use after the third collect, with eleven thanksgivings. These prayers, in general, are more gracefully written than certain ones in the 1928 book, and some touch upon more burning topics —*e.g.*, unemployment. Above each psalm is printed the date of its use according to the sequence of the Sunday course; in the marriage service the preface is modified but the customary

vows are retained. Everywhere the traditional structure and order are retained, and we may say that the keynotes of the book are enrichment without confusion and simplicity without sparseness. In one sphere the compilers have allowed themselves originality, in the provision of six brief forms of family prayer, wholly admirable both in form and substance.

And so we heartily welcome the *Churchpeople's Prayer Book*. It gives a new charter to the layman. It brings the Anglican back to take his stand upon what he has, and removes something of that restless hankering after what is at present denied him; and gives a fresh impetus to the movement for the compilation of a new Book of *Common* Prayer, as against the confusion of semi-legalized alternatives, and holds out hope of that restoration of Church consciousness which comes from an identical form of approach to the throne of God.

J. L. BEAUMONT JAMES.

NOTICES

THE FRANCISCAN MESSAGE AND THE WORLD. By Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M., Rector of the Catholic University of Milan. Translated by Henry L. Hughes. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.

Almost as interesting as Dr. Gemelli's volume on the influence of Franciscan thought upon the past centuries, and the influence of the centuries upon Franciscan thought, is the way in which he came to hold his present position; or, rather, how the present position came into being at all. This we are told in a preface by his translator, Father H. L. Hughes.

Agostino Gemelli, when studying medicine at the University of Paris, was an earnest believer in Haeckel and Karl Marx, till he broke suddenly with his past, and to the "dismayed astonishment" of his professors entered a Franciscan monastery near Brescia. Ordained priest in 1906, he became in the same year a fully professed Franciscan; and his life-work lay clearly before him. This must be, to quote Fr. Hughes, "to bring God back into the lives of the intellectual classes, in whose hands lay the ultimate fate of the unlettered masses." It cannot but surprise us that this call should come to and be answered by a Franciscan. The present Pope, Benedict XV., was quick to seize the great opportunity, and it was Gemelli whom he chose to found in Milan a Catholic University. At first it appeared impossible to contend on equal terms with the State-subsidized and rigidly controlled Universities throughout the country; but in 1921 private generosity enabled a start to be made, and an annual "University Day" was inaugurated, when collections for necessary funds should be made in every church in the land. When Government recognition was sought for the Catholic University, the objection was raised that it did not possess the capital required by law. "Against this," as Fr. Hughes proceeds to tell us, "Gemelli could only shew the type-written memoranda

of the results of 'University Day.' The philosopher Gentile, a Sicilian, then Minister of Education, turned at once to the account of the 'Day' in his own island. Running his finger down the sheet, the statesman paused before the names of secluded mountain villages against which a substantial contribution was set down. From personal knowledge of such out-of-the way places he realized that the Catholic University was really wanted by a very considerable section of the Italian people, and granted full legal status, the degrees conferred being declared of equal value to those obtained as State Universities."

Dr. Gemelli disclaims any attempt at giving a history of the Franciscan Order, or a treatise on its thought. He traces the development of "Franciscan spirituality" century by century, giving as he goes thumb-nail sketches, and in some cases life-size portraits, of outstanding personalities in the Order. St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus (of whom Dr. Gemelli is an ardent disciple), Roger Bacon, and Raymond Lull lead off the great procession. Respectful allusion is made to St. Thomas Aquinas; but the age-long conflict between Scotists and Thomists is barely mentioned.

Division within the Order first appeared on the death of St. Francis, the zealots, admitting no modification of the Rule, calling themselves the Spirituali; the others, later called Conventuals, admitting change and development. By the sixteenth century this cleavage had resulted in three branches: the Conventuals, now become the men of learning; the Observants, simple, popular preachers; and the Capuchins, also preachers, but frequently hermits as well.

The magnificent record is given of seven centuries' work in foreign mission fields: Palestine, China, Japan, Morocco, etc., lands watered with the blood of many martyrs. Impossibilities were not admitted, discouragement did not deter; and from the time of St. Francis himself, and of Raymond Lull soon after, the stream of heroism has never run dry.

It is distressing to read that the great St. Alphonsus Liguori should have countenanced so hideous a travesty of Christianity as is given on p. 186: "The opinion concerning the number of sins which God is willing to tolerate in each human being, from which it follows that, since they do not know that number, each person should fear lest, by adding to past transgressions new sins, they should overstep the mark, be abandoned by God, and lost for all eternity."

Few things have contributed more to the permanence of Franciscan influence than the great Third Order. Tertiaries have been, and still are, found in every station in life; and the bond of union is a great reality. The right interpretation of Poverty, both for them and all branches of the Order, is beautifully drawn out by Dr. Gemelli. It forms, as he contends, together with Liberty, "the supremacy of the Will" (a phrase with an oddly antiquated ring), and Action, the abiding message of the followers of St. Francis to this and indeed to every time.

More careful proof-reading, especially of proper names, would have advantaged the book; and the curious slip of Kahn for Khan occurs on no less than three successive pages.

E. C. GREGORY.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOLOGY. By E. O. James, D.Litt. S.P.C.K. 4s.

Every student of the Bible will be glad of such light as can be received from other branches of knowledge. It is one of the signs of the times

that we have help from archæology and comparative philology such as we have never had before, and, at least since the publication of Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*, we have learnt something of what anthropology can give us. We naturally, then, welcome an interesting interpretation of the religious history of Israel from the pen of one of our foremost anthropologists.

The first impression we form on reading these lectures by Dr. James is the extent to which they confirm opinions already widely held. In fact, much of the book is a summary—a very useful summary in spite of some curious errors—of the position held by the normal scholar of the critical type of mind. In literature, archæology, and history Professor James makes no claim to originality, though he does feel free to criticize and to weigh conflicting theories. In these matters his judgment is unusually sound and his opinions clearly and cautiously expressed. His own contribution to Old Testament study is contained especially in Chapters IV.-VI., where he deals with the myth and ritual of the ancient east, with the religion of Israel before the conquest, and with Moses and Yahweh. Even in the first of these three the ground covered is practically that of Hooke's *Myth and Ritual*, but the other two chapters are real contributions to our knowledge of the background against which we should see the religion of the Old Testament. Particularly interesting is the stress laid by Professor James on the appearance of "high gods" among primitive peoples, and on the conception of a tribal "All-father." It is, perhaps, a little unfortunate that the term "monotheism" is used in connection with this latter conception, since it may lead an unscientific reader astray; the idea of this "All-father," as the author carefully explains, is a very different thing from monotheism as we usually understand it. But many people do not read explanations. Probably we want a new word altogether for this type of religious belief. In spite of this disadvantage, however, the prominence given to this idea in the interpretation, at least, of the background of many Old Testament beliefs is very welcome, and, indeed, the book as a whole forms an interesting contribution to the study of the Bible.

T. H. Robinson.

The Archæology of Herod's Temple. By F. J. Hollis, D.D. Dent. 18s.

As Dr. Oesterley points out in a foreword, this learned monograph is exceptionally important, because its author is a mathematician, and before entering the ministry was for many years an engineer. To this specialized knowledge is added exhaustive study of the Jewish tradition, which in the chief point at issue is right: the Holy of Holies was actually situated on the sacred rock, as tradition states, and modern scholars who believe that the altar was on the rock are mistaken. Dr. Hollis begins with what he calls a "Short Survey of the Site," which is for all practical purposes exhaustive; he gets down to the hard rock, disregarding the many centuries of accumulated soil. "Tradition placed the altar of sacrifice *in* the threshing-floor of Araunah, and a suitable position for a threshing-floor would have been on the fairly level hill-top surrounding the Sacred Rock, but not on the rock itself." The Tract Middoth is translated with an exhaustive Commentary, and thirty full-page plans and diagrams are also given, so that all the materials are presented which

will enable later scholars to come to different conclusions if, as is improbable, any are found competent and willing to work over the ground again.

Dr. Hollis' own theory regarding the axis of the Temple is expressed modestly but clearly as follows:

"It is probable that Solomon's Temple was built with its axis directed towards the Mount of Olives, because there was some tradition as to the sanctity of that Mount, and this tradition may have had its origin in the sun-cult of early times. When worship was expressed to shew the *disavowal of sun-worship* the axis of the Temple might quite conceivably have been directed due east and west, in order that the worshippers might turn their backs definitely to the rising sun, and their faces towards the west, thus making a complete break with all the old traditions of sun-worship which clustered about the axial direction of the earlier Temple."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON SINS AND THEIR REMEDIES. By a group of priests. With a Foreword by Rev. Canon K. E. Kirk, D.D. Faith Press, Ltd. 2s. 6d.

Every confessor, every parish priest, especially those who are just beginning the difficult work of guiding souls, should know this book and have it by them for reference. The authors know what is required of a priest, and their words are supported by Dr. Kirk, who has already earned a reputation by his writings on moral theology. Older priests who had no such assistance as this book when they began their ministry rejoice to think how their younger brethren can now escape their bitter experience through ignorance. Here is a guide that can be trusted, and no part is more valuable than the insistence on priests working together with doctors in matters of great difficulties and with other trained mental specialists. If the mistrust that many doctors have of the wisdom of clergy could be removed and a helpful exchange of knowledge set up, the gain would be considerable in every way.

W. E. LUTYENS.

THE UNITED FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By J. Barr. Allenson. 6s.

Mr. Barr's book is to us a monument of misapplied learning. It is meant as a defence of the diehard position of the Free Church, and we find it difficult to do justice to it. The chapter on the Anglican Church and union—the author means reunion—leaves us inly wondering. We give a typical quotation: "It is highly perilous for the Free Churches to enter into negotiations for union with a Church by law established. Concessions will be made and readjustments of privilege; glaring scandals like the sale of livings may be abandoned; tithe distraint will be effected in some less conspicuous way. The grip of the State will be relaxed. But behind every compromise will be the determination on the part of the Anglican Church to give Establishment a new lease of life, and to secure it in all time coming." Even yet there is an unmistakable difference in ethos in the ministers of the Established Church and those of the United Free Church, and this difference is plain in every line that the author writes.

R. H. MURRAY.

NATURE AND ILLUMINATION. By Geraldine Hodgson, D.Litt. Rider and Co. 7s. 6d.

The publishers' wrapper of this book describes it as "one of the best books ever written on the subject of mysticism," and that "it passes beyond mere religious doctrine to the intimate soul of man himself." The wrapper also calls Baudelaire Bandelaire. This sort of puff is hard on Miss Hodgson and must be offensive to her. On the one hand it commends the book as written for self-opinionated dabblers in vague mysticism. But on the other Miss Hodgson is careful to state that her book is only an essay into one particular and limited section of such experience and that her purpose is by examination to facilitate that the less profitable may be recognized and the more valuable made clear and mapped by the formulation of religious doctrine. The book is written because she is puzzled how to pass from the mere collection of the intimacies of individual souls to the considered judgment of religious doctrine.

Miss Hodgson's particular subject in this book is the "function of natural things in bringing men to see and know God."

Whether that approach is mystic, or how far it is, depends on the decision made in the well-worn controversy of what is mystical. Miss Hodgson cautiously adopts a definition by Père de Guibert. This experience of God through nature is only part of a greater whole, which in its fullest and richest form is found in the Christian religion. Miss Hodgson then confines her enquiry to "Christian theists" and for the most part to Catholics. For those who are in the tradition of the whole are more likely to be right in the part. The experience in the part and the narration of the experience are both influenced by the wider tradition. Miss Hodgson acts on these principles, but does not give them their full influence in her discussion of definitions.

The book is in two parts. The first deals with the problems of the connection between nature and the mystical, of nature as leading to the mystical, and of its results in the mystical. These chapters contain studies of Baudelaire and of Night. The second part consists of quotations from mystics of all ages, saints, theologians, and poets. The longest and least known is from Bonaventure. One might add that it is also the most difficult to understand.

In this book Miss Hodgson makes great use of her wide reading of ancient and modern authorities; and most humbly subordinates her own part to their witness.

RICHARD L. BARNES, C.R.

LA REDENZIONE: CONFERENZE BIBLICHE. Rome. 1934.

This volume of 330 pages contains the papers contributed at the Biblical Conference held in Rome in 1933, the year of jubilee. There are twelve papers by nine contributors who are either Religious or Seminary Professors. The editor, who himself contributes two papers, is Father A. Vaccari, S.J. The papers deal with a large variety of subjects connected with the redeeming work of Christ as it appears in the Bible. Four of the contributors write on Old Testament prophecies and psalms, the Servant of Jahve as depicted in Isaiah, the account of His sufferings, the "Resurrection Psalm" (xvi.) and the Book of Psalms as a whole. There is also a very interesting discussion on the idea of redemption in the Psalms of Solomon. The other papers treat of New Testament

subjects, such as the Cry from the Cross, the legal aspects of Christ's trial, and various modern criticisms of the resurrection narratives. As would of course be expected, the authors take a very conservative line in all critical questions, arguing, for instance, in favour of real prophecy in the sense of an actual foretelling of the resurrection in Psalm xvi., and accepting the genuineness of 2 Peter. As would be equally expected, the subjects are treated throughout at a very high spiritual level, with great learning and fine religious feeling. In one of the papers there is a very forcible critique of the uncertainty and subjectivity that marks the school of "Form Criticism" in its attempted reconstruction of the original gospel narrative. This work quotes many contemporary English theologians, such as Professor Emery Barnes on the Psalms (*non solo moderazione ma persino timidità*), Dr. Sparrow-Simpson and Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke. It is altogether a very interesting and valuable presentation of present-day Roman Catholic learning upon the subjects of which it treats.

W. R. V. BRADE.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By B. Macdonald, Ph.D. T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d.

The object of this book is to present "a unified account of the worship of the Primitive Church as related to the spiritual experiences of the worshippers." In other words, the author has endeavoured to give an account of early Christian worship, derived from his investigation of the spiritual condition of early Christians as revealed by the writers of the New Testament, and the early Church. The result, as we might expect, is largely a matter of guesswork, and the author's inferences often fail to carry conviction.

At the same time he has brought considerable learning to bear on the problems he discusses, and his book is worth reading as a reasoned and balanced statement of advanced modernist opinion on such questions as the origin of baptism and the Eucharist. He rejects the opinion that either of these sacraments was instituted by Christ. He thinks the Eucharist originated in a simple fellowship meal, without wine. Later on the Gentile Christians added wine as an essential part of the feast. St. Paul made its use obligatory and brought into the picture the death of Christ, which had been no part of the original rite.

The author does not appear to have read Dr. Gavin's book on the Jewish antecedents of the Christian sacraments, for Dr. Gavin has shewn that there is no need to look outside the Jewish Church to find the origin of Christian sacraments.

He revels in the use of hyphenated expressions, such as table-fellowship, worship-assemblies, Supper-celebration, worship-thought, dying-and-rising-again-Saviour-God; they occur continually and are ugly and unnecessary.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

THE TEXT OF ACTS IN CODICIL 614 (TISCH. 137) AND ITS ALLIES. Edited by the late A. V. Valentine-Richards, M.A. With an Introduction by J. M. Creed, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 6s.

This neat edition of an important witness to the "Western Text" of Acts had been prepared by its editor some years before his death, and is now issued *ex pietate* with a technical preface by Professor Creed. The

app. crit. gives the readings of three other allied minuscules and an appendix collates a fourth, all from v. Soden's $I^{\alpha 1}$ and $I^{\alpha 2}$ groups. A much fuller view of the characteristics of this group can now be obtained than from the apparatus of either Ropes or A. C. Clarke, without, however, modifying their views as to its nature in any obvious respect. It is evidently Syrian, and its chief interest lies in its derivation. Ropes suggested that it derives from an analogue to the "Cæsarean" text of the Gospels. Dr. Creed suggests a collateral relation to the Greek text underlying that elusive entity, the version of Philoxenus of Mabug.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

LOSING RELIGION TO FIND IT. By Erica Lindsay. J. M. Dent and Sons. 6s.

Although it contains a number of homely illustrations this is a serious essay. It is a plea for the reconsideration of the idea of Freedom as involving spiritual principles that are as enduring and undeviating as are the laws of material existence. The method is dialectical, and we are shewn that out of the clash of Law and Freedom issues creative activity. The folly of our age is pure mechanism on the one hand and unadulterated licence on the other, but Truth is to be found in taking account of a certain freedom dependent upon an equally certain determinism; or, rather, in tension between them. Reality is not simply factual, it is something more than fact, and is to be found in freedom acting against living unity with law and the everlasting determination of things. Moral freedom only exists where moral standards are recognized. The quality of free actions is determined by the quality of the standard from which they may be deviations. The aimless freedom of the present age, which "tries to exist precariously with the sole aid of opportunist codes," challenges Christianity to redeem it with a religion that proclaims an eternal necessity at the heart of things. Its adherents will, therefore, of necessity itself be called on to endure hardness. "Christianity will not let us escape from consciously relating free sensitive perception and love in the individual with intelligent understanding of steadfast impartial necessity." We could wish that modern writers would avoid such phrases (pp. 13 and 32) as: "It is the specialized journeymen who," and "It is they . . . who are." But there are some noble passages in this book, and there is very much that deserves careful and thoughtful attention. H. S. MARSHALL.

BRIEF INTRODUCTIONS TO THE LESSONS FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS ACCORDING TO THE NEW LECTIONARY. By J. W. Hunkin, D.D. S.P.C.K. 4s.

This is a useful companion to the New Lectionary. As Dr. Hunkin says in his preface: "It is indeed always difficult when an unfamiliar passage is read from an ancient document to pick up its drift at once." His purpose, therefore, is to supply the man in the pew with sufficient comment upon the passage about to be read as will enable him to follow it intelligently and profitably.

All these introductions have the merit of being really short—sometimes no more than one crisp sentence is found necessary—and in a remarkable way they constantly reveal the central message of the passage. But occasionally the writer misses an opportunity in the Old Testament lections of shewing how true it is that the Old Testament lies hidden

in the New, and that all that the Prophets had spoken is fulfilled in the person of our Lord. Thus, in his note on Haggai ii. 1-9 (to be read at Evensong on the Sunday next before Advent), he might have added a sentence or two which would show the connection of thought in this lesson between the last Sunday in the Christian year and the Advent season about to begin—that is, that in the coming of God Incarnate is fulfilled the promised restoration of all things.

There is a useful appendix of suggested lessons for special occasions, such as Industrial Sunday, Hospital Sunday, and another commemoration which threatens to creep into the calendar, Municipal Sunday. Though we deprecate the tendency to interrupt the course of the liturgical year by the allocation of fresh titles to particular Sundays, the choice of lessons here offered for special occasions is peculiarly apt. Dr. Hunkin also draws attention to the rather surprising omission of certain passages, which are never read on Sundays, such as Gen. xlviii. and Rom. x.

Altogether this is a most useful handbook for the Lectern.

D. ARMYTAGE.

BOOK NOTES

Did Jesus Ever Live? By L. G. Rylands, B.A., B.Sc. Watts. 2s. 6d. The writer is introduced by the publisher as "a profound scholar on the subject." The quality of the scholarship can be tested by statements like that on p. 21, which relies on the Tübingen School for doubting the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles other than the first four; or that on p. 32, which pillories the Acts for representing James as killed by Herod in ch. xii. and as a chief apostle in ch. xxi.—"it is hopeless to attempt to extract history from such documents." Golgotha connected with Jesus is Gilgal connected with Joshua; at the desolate Gilgal the cult of the Jesus-god was secretly practised. The man Jesus never existed. It is useful to know the kind of propaganda carried out by anti-Christian publishers.

W. K. L. C.

Conscious and Unconscious Sin. By R. E. D. Clark, M.A., Ph.D. Williams and Norgate. 4s. 6d. Certain critics of Christianity stress the fact that many devoted Christians, having repented of their conscious sins, remain in ignorance of many unconscious ones which are obvious to other people, and in consequence these critics hold Christianity responsible for drugging the conscience. The writer exposes the injustice of this accusation. Our Lord was as much aware as these critics of the inconsistency of character they point out, and warned men continually of these unconscious sins, this unconscious hypocrisy. Out of many points systematically dealt with by the writer we select the following. He pursues the subject in detail through the realms of the conscious and of the unconscious mind, and shews how emotionally disagreeable ideas tend to be relegated to the unconsciousness. When they seek expression it is by way of rationalization, the motives thus being made to appear to the consciousness as praiseworthy rather than blameworthy. He shews how the New Testament points the way towards overcoming this vicious tendency to self-justification. He analyzes the processes of mystic experiences and "guidance," disclosing not only the spiritual advantages, but also the possibilities of self-deception inherent in such experiences.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXX

JANUARY—JUNE, 1935

PAGE

Anglo-Scandinavian Conference, An 44
Approach to Re-union, The 326
BARNES, W. EMERY 269
BEDALE, S. 232
BELL, BERNARD IDDINGS 141
Bergson's, M., "Two Sources" 136
Bezaleel: The Artist Craftsman 287
BOMBAY, Bishop of 161
Books Reviewed:
Bible and Hellenism, The. By C. H. Dodd 366
Church and State in the Eighteenth Century. By N. Sykes 240
Church of God, The. An Anglo-Russian Symposium 178
Church People's Prayer Book, The 373
Counter-Reformation, The. By B. J. Kidd 176
Decline and Fall of the Mediæval Papacy, The. By L. E. Elliot Binns 302
Devotion and Discipleship. By H. McNeile 308
History of the Church, A. By Philip Hughes 51
Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology, The. By R. Newton Flew . 49
Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, An. By W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson 116
Nature, Man and God. By the Archbishop of York 243
Problem of Evil, The. By Hubert S. Box 111
Reformation in England, The. I. The English Schism. By G. Constant 48
Religous Thought in the Eighteenth Century. By J. M. Creed and J. S. Boys-Smith 306
Sceptical Approach to Religion, The. By P. E. More 304
Spiritual Letters of Dom Chapman. By R. Huddleston 369
World and God, The. By Hubert S. Box 111
BOULDEN, J. L. 222
BOUQUET, A. C. 363
BROWN, E. F. 43
CANNON, W. W. 116
Capitals of Reverence 293
CARPENTER, S. C. 240
Cathedral Service, The 171
Catholic Doctrine of Freedom and Secular Totalitarianism, The . . . 334
CAVALIER, H. 104
CHANDLER, BISHOP 136
Christ and Philosophy 104
Christian Principles in Society 94
Christian Salvation 169
Church and State 36
CLARKE, O. R. 171, 364
CLARKE, W. K. LOWTHER 172, 230, 264, 293
Correspondence 36, 229, 364
CROSS, F. L. 306
DEMANT, V. A. 345
Divine Personality 279
DRON, JAMES A. 287
DUNKLEY, E. H. 351
Economic Morality and the Individual 141
EDMUNDS, C. H. 36
Election of St. Matthias, The 230
Emmaus 298
EVANS, E. 279
Evidential Value of Miracles, The 37
Exodus in the New Testament, The 105
FRANKLIN, H. L. 365
Guignebert and Loisy 264
HARTON, F. P. 308
HEBERT, A. G. 44, 304
Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel 364
Holy Spirit and Eternal Life, The 346
Incarnation of the Word of God, The 86

	PAGE
JAMES, J. L. BEAUMONT	375
JENKINS, CLAUDE	302
John Wesley and the American Episcopate	239
Journey to Emmaus	365
KARTASHOV, ANTON	6
KELLY, ALFRED D.	37
KELLY, H.	294
KIRK, K. E.	176
KNOX, WILFRED L.	368
LANCEFIELD, ARTHUR P.	237, 239
Lord's Supper in the Reformed Church of Holland, The	237
LYTTELTON, E.	169
MACDONALD, A. J.	51
MACKENZIE, K. D.	49
MASCALL, E. L.	18, 70
Message of Nicholas Berdyaev, The	207
MIDDLETON, R. D.	276
MOBERLEY, R. H.	167
Modern Morality	232
MORETON, H. A.	48
Moss, C. B.	178
New Guinea, The Bishop of	229
New Liddell and Scott, The	172
Note on the Situation in Germany, A	362
Notes on Periodicals	47, 110, 173, 300
OLDAKER, W. H.	156
Old Testament Group Movement, An	162
Old Testament in the Christian Church, The	269
PARKER, J. W.	162
Pastoralia	351
Philippians ii. 5-8	298
PITTINGER, W. NORMAN	86, 364
Place for Dreams in the Problem of Control, The	215
Prayer to the Holy Ghost	167, 168
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T.	168
Problem of Holy Week, The	151
QUICK, O. C.	198
Realistic Crucifix, The	222
Religion and Youth	198
Resurrection	293
ROGERS, CLEMENT F.	151
Russian Christianity	6
St. JOHN, HENRY	334
St. Matthew xiii. 8-10	43
Schools and the Parish	156
SEAMAN, CHARLES E.	297
SIMPSON, ALAN H.	207
SIMPSON, E. J.	94
SPENCER, G. E. C.	359
SPENS, MAISIE	109
STACY, PAUL	361, 362
SWALLOW, J. E.	298
SYKES, N. D.	36
Theology of Annoyance, The	294
Three Modern Approaches to God	18, 70
TURNER, J. E.	243
UNDERHILL, EVELYN	373
VALENTINE, CYRIL H.	111
Veni Creator	161
Versions of the Bible	36
Vibration in Nature and Supernature	361
Whitsuntide Processional	360
WIGRAM, P. S.	215
WILLINK, M. D. R.	105
WYLDE, J.	293
Youth: A Pastor's Self-Examination	276

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER